THEOLOGY

majority of the English bishops from their sees and appointed

others to their places. For commonwers disprove almost

A Montbly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Rev. E. G. SELWYN, D.D., REDHILL REGTORY, HAVANZ, to whom all editorial matters should be addressed.

Vol. XVI

MARCH, 1928

No. 93

EDITORIAL

WE publish a number of articles this month on the conception of the Church and the nature and basis of its unity. Mr. R. E. Gordon George, a Roman Catholic layman, writes on the two contrasted ideals which are represented by Federation and by Reunion, and points out the necessity of the latter policy for all who believe that the Church is the expression of a supernatural order and depends upon the unity of the divine Life. Her unity, therefore, is not artificial, but organic. The Rev. K. D. Mackenzie reviews the Lausanne Conference, and brings out clearly the important measure of confessional agreement which was recorded. The Master of Corpus, well known to our readers as Mr. Will Spens, closes the triad of articles with a searching consideration of the nature of the Church's social structure, and a strong plea that the best analogy for it is that of a race rather than that of a society. His claim that this conception is far more concordant than the other with the Church's dependence upon the divine Life and with New Testament conceptions generally will, we believe, command assent; and it provides solid ground for a doctrine of authority which, while not Roman, is thoroughly Catholic.

Next month we hope to publish a paper by Professor Cuthbert Turner on the Conversations at Malines; and we should wish that paper to be read with the three published this

month as forming together a kind of symposium.

Meanwhile the cause of Christian unity is not advanced by the further excursion into history made by Cardinal Bourne in his recent allocution to his flock. The Cardinal is concerned to show that Queen Elizabeth caused a breach in the continuity of the English Church, because she extruded the xvi. 93

majority of the English bishops from their sees and appointed others to their places. You can prove or disprove almost anything when you leave out most of the facts. What the Cardinal omits to mention is that the bishops appointed by Edward VI. and deprived by Mary, like Coverdale of Exeter, came back as soon as they could. But they were, of course, few, for Mary had adopted a more effective method than Elizabeth of breaking the continuity of the Episcopate. She had burnt her bishops. And we do not remember that these proceedings had the sanction of Convocation.

The discussions in the Church Assembly last month have added immensely, we believe, to the Assembly's prestige and authority in the minds both of Church and Nation. It would have been so easy to try and trim the sails to catch the breeze of popular favour; and, though the appeal was often made, we rejoice that all three Houses rejected it and stuck boldly to their guns. The more, indeed, that the principal issues were examined, the more clear it became that the balance of the Deposited Book was a genuine expression of the Church's mind. The greatest gratitude is due to the Archbishops and Bishops who have been real leaders to the Church in these critical days; and the loyalty and enthusiasm which their consistency has evolved are a force which will regenerate the spiritual life of our time, whether or not Parliament gives the Book legal sanction. On that point prognostications are of little value: at least the Church has been true to itself and can face the future without dismay,

mit allers die offen and their edges er en 42 de northeonie sin

work allegelian which the thirty of the company of the state of the st

because evenied on the planety produced because

ytheri, and a sample of the states the salience of the characteristic and the chara

-distributed from the state of the state of

Republish the relative to the part of the received

and the second of the second second second the dates.

CO JYN

manual lumber or element realized estate modernous reclinich mi

become some in the fact that the fact and a transmit a transmit a

rough and their discount, a historian dayler in thesit, and much a

maily of the English Charged decays who extraded the

ORTHODOXY'S DEMAND FOR CHURCH UNITY

and charges by them over and in a situation

THE first of the blessings which came with the movement towards Church Unity which has been associated with the Appeal from Lambeth is goodwill. Bitterness, denominational superciliousness, controversial polemics, have been discredited, and their place has been taken by charity and sympathy to which every effort at understanding brings us nearer. From goodwill there has been an advance towards something more organic in corporate activity. It led to the scholarly and nice conclusions of Copec, and to the impressive gathering at Stockholm, when, all communions being represented but the Papal, unity expressed itself in a solemn pronouncement in favour of international well-being and harmony. It was recognized that Christianity was not only the salvation of individual nations, but that to be so it must also be international. And in this direction something more was done at Lausanne. All this is summed up in the reply the Baptists published in April in reply to the Lambeth Appeal in one word which they proposed to substitute for unity—federation. Federation implies the willingness of definitely separated bodies to work together for certain purposes. It is a subject which might be edged with detailed proposal. At Stockholm and at Lausanne the conferences formulated a practical policy, and an enunciation of something ethical, or possibly dogmatic, on which that policy is based. But one must not ignore the insidious strivings in which good intentions have too often been enmeshed, and in which some vague minds are already tripping. For the unity of a body is the reasonable life which orders and informs it; it works towards even exacter accomplishment; fitly and compactly framed together for skilled exercise, it wins to triumph only because its growth is not unwieldy, because that strength, to which every organ and member supplies, according to its effectual working, a measured and essential increase, can be concentrated with the exact knowledge of instinct on the end which mind and will propose for it. This can be the only meaning of that similitude to which St. Paul so frequently recurred, now in one connection, now in another, to express his inspired doctrine of the unity of the Church. The corporate unity of which he wrote shares little or nothing with the ideas implied by contemporary Baptists when, so appositely, they chose the word "federation."

For a federation is a willing agreement of separate and independent individuals to work together for certain ends which do not affect their internal government. It was a great decision of Haig's when the Allied Armies were placed under the supreme command of Foch, for it changed the war in France from one of allied armies, separately controlled, to one army, and so gave it, as we know, an effectiveness which finished the war. But the allied countries never contemplated such a unity of governments. It was possible for the armies, only because on the one side the Generalissimo permitted a certain independence to another national temperament, and on the other because the military science provided a field in which the two nations could work congruently in spite of their instinctive differentiation. And furthermore, it was a temporary expedient to assist the allied peoples. But the federation was itself an expedient; every federation is a temporary expedient; its basis is the view its constituents hold of their own individual advantage. They may realize that their advantage depends on a view of life embracing more than the constituent. But it is made by, and only exists by, the choice of the constituents. A federation is an agreement of separate entities for a purpose. A body is an essential unity of organic functions inevitably mutual, but governed by the purpose of the head.

Unity, in other words, is life, and not a formula. There is nothing more opposed to the idea of unity than tolerance founded on indifference. And it is just that apathy which beguiles so many into thinking that agreement, or agreement to differ, on certain points, attains the end of unity. Yet that is precisely the thought which most appeals to many whose object, consciously or unconsciously, is satisfied by the partial though certain advantage of federation. They mistake the energy of a living Church for an agreement, for a formula. Let us reach such and such conclusions, they say, and then permit, nay welcome, divergence. Is not that exactly the state of mind which, having arrived at goodwill, cares nothing for the great danger we are in by our unhappy divisions? is content to think that what St. Paul meant by the ideal he urged in the words "one body, one Spirit, one faith," was simply a highest common factor of irreconcilable divergence. It would mean that the Church of God should cultivate a lazy and ineffective vagueness for the detailed and ordered perfectness of an edifice planned, governed, and inhabited by the Spirit of charity, wisdom, and power. The energy and precision of practical unity of the spirit is in immediate and final conflict with the chaotic inertia, the inchoate uncertainty of those who get no further than a generalization, a platitude, even if it is Love, even though in itself it should be inspired.

Let us be careful, then, to see exactly what we may gain by goodwill and by federation, and to work it out as far as we can. Let us never lose sight of the fact that mutual interest, and co-operation, each anticipates many of the advantages of reunion, and are to be sought for to the utmost possible; but in doing so, let us define with equal clearness the beginnings of that vast champaign which is waiting to be turned from a devastated area into villages and vineyards by the tireless enterprise of an ambition for those divine things which embrace, but transcend, the necessary

tasks of honour and moral expediency. For the Church of God, though the last safeguard of human welfare, exists to preach and to maintain a supernatural order. And this supernatural order conflicts not only with corruption but with all merely human standards, so that humanity can only be saved by ruthlessness with what is no more than human. Returning good for evil, love for enmity, mercy for despiteful usage; finding the blessedness of being despised, of being poor in spirit, of being humble and meek; laying down our life for our friends, which, in Christianity, means laying it down also for our enemies—all these run obviously counter to nature, and to the wild justice of the natural law. But it is just these counsels of perfection which are typical of the Church, because they are founded on truths of the Divine Nature. And to maintain them the Church, for all her forbearance, must be at times uncompromising. The fury with which the Redeemer whipped the moneychangers from the temple, or turned upon a generation of vipers, with which in the joy of the Resurrection He plainly told His own faithful followers that they were fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets had spoken, is an aspect of the Divine Nature, and therefore of the Divine prerogatives of the Church which represents Him, just as patience and mercy are. She represents God, not merely as the Creator, but as the Trinity in Unity, dwelling in light unapproachable. Endued with His authority, applying His supernatural graces, manifesting His undying life, she insists that there is no unity but in Him. This is exactly the opposite of the principles of federation: it replaces choice by faith. Now there is in faith a certain acquiescence of the will: but the will is moved by grace to an acceptance of certain intellectual propositions, and grace is not a human quality. It is, in the expression of Aquinas, similitude participata divina natura, a likeness to God Himself,

accorded as His gift. Faith of this kind, perfectly distinct from the private judgment which can accept or reject it, is the basis of the supernatural unity of the Church. It has its origin and impulse in the Creator's unity, not in creation's diversity. It can be attained only by spiritual unity with a supernatural order, and can only be recognized as visible in a visible supernatural society. Loyalty to that society, loyalty so complete that separation from it, for any purpose whatever, in any circumstances, would be intolerable because it is the organ of God's relation to humanity, is Christian faith in action. This is the meaning, therefore, of Church unity: a faith in the society which is supernatural, which is the Body of Christ, which is in fact the congregation of the faithful.

If we turn at once to an elucidation of those familiar expressions, we engage in controversy. Let us think first of the unity of the Divine Nature, of which grace makes us a partaker. God being mind thinks ever a thought, a thought which is ever realized as a concept, as a Logos, generated from Himself as a reasonable perfection—that is to say a Person, and so His Son. Yet in and between the two reasonable perfections of the Begetter and the Begotten is that inalienable cleaving to good which in each is both Himself and the Other-which is ever present to each and both who are ever receiving, inhaling and exhaling, as it were breath from the human body. And this realization of a Presence, which is both personal and mutual, is itself a reasonable perfection, not generated like a concept, but proceeding like an air, or a presence, or fire, or light, or dew, from the very nature of love: so that God's unity is by its

very perfection inevitably a Trinity.

Yet again, this Trinity in Unity, perfect and self-sufficient, by the very nature of its perfect love, power and intelligence, radiates into that which is without it, and draws from nothingness something which is inspired either in a defectible order by the process of its power, or in indefectible order by an organic unity with itself. This is the origin of both the variety of nature and of the diversified operations of the Church. But the variety all proves the unity by which it is sustained. Both in nature and in the Church there is a purpose and an order. It is that order, governed by that purpose, which gives creation unity. While, however, natural unity does not involve the salvation of each entity, but rather the maintenance of the whole through change and development, the nature of man inevitably involves reason. And reason, though it uses outward things, is independent of them. There is no ground for thinking that it shares in the change and decay which the body shares with nature. There is every ground to expect that it should maintain its life, and increase it, as it did in first escaping from antenatal gloom. The very arguments which nature offers us imply that the mind of man is a sojourner on earth, awaiting a further opportunity according to proved capacities. If so each mind needs to be identified with the divine order. The Church as the Ark of Salvation requires therefore to identify man with the unity. of God, not in his governance of defectibility, but in His essential moral permanence. The unity of God, in relation to the mind of man, needs to absorb each man into the invisible order. But if God redeems, if God gives grace and this, as we saw, is essential to the orthodoxy of the Church-He absorbs men, not merely into a reasonable order, but into His very Nature. His love permeates and encompasses our love till we love Him with that same love with which He loves His own good. We become the temples of His Holy Spirit. To the saint to live is Christ.

Now, it is essential to orthodoxy to believe in the Incarnation, and to see in the first Christmas the exordium of a sacramental dispensation. For in redemption God saves man as man, an immortal being working in and through a nature made of defectible instruments. These the incarnate Saviour absorbed into His nature; these, changed into His Body, and glorified at His resurrection, He carried into heaven. And these, blessed for the use of man, thus have contact with the life of reason; but—and this is far more wonderful—absorbed again into the personality of the Uncreated by the Spirit of Love, they themselves become the vehicles of redemption, the means of grace, the tangible immediacy in act and power of the humanity of Christ our God. A Sacramental religion is

essential to orthodoxy.

Orthodoxy therefore presents a view of universal unity in which God's governance of the world in its order with other worlds meets His invisible perfection in the nature of man, who, completing the harmony between nature and God, finds in that function an identification in grace through the variety of nature with the unity of God. This is the function of the Church. This is the meaning, and this is the means, of its unity. It finds in nature the vehicle of God's intimate and unifying approach: it finds in reason a means to apprehend and state eternal truths.

But since each in the Church finds his unity through the impulse of indwelling love with God, he finds it also with every member of the Church. The Church, that is to say, the means of the visible apotheosis of visible things, inspires

her members with the grace of Christ'so as to look into the mirror of His truth and to express it in terms of reason; with the love of God, so as to share the power He exerts over creation; with the fellowship of the Holy Ghost, so as to unite all her members with Him and with one another as members of one Body. And though all these are done mystically, yet they are, as we saw, done in human terms. Just as the artist takes advantage of the limitations his medium imposes upon him, so the Church becomes the means of the increase of God's glory, through her use of human and natural instruments: and the symbol, in becoming identical with what it signifies, makes that supernal thing signified more radiantly significant: or, rather, the range of the radiance proves its intensity. It is the greatest triumph of Divine love that it embraces the whole nature of man, that through his own lips man absorbs the nourishment by which, in St. Augustine's beautiful expression, he is absorbed into God.

On the Church, then, has come the Light of the World, and the glory of the Lord is risen upon her. Nations walk in her light and kings in the splendour of her rising. But it is the very property of light to remove vagueness: it shows out detail; as the hill's shadow steals from the meadow, the flowery enamelling comes out in all its clearness from the velvety blue. The light of life, then, far from leaving the vagueness which some people call simplicity, defines in clearer and clearer outlines the differentiation of truth from error, and the relation of one truth, or beauty, to another. If unity comes from light, and not from darkness (which symbolizes not unity but nothing), then that unity will best be attained by the most thorough examination and elucidation of principles till we see the one principle, the one mind which informs them. And since the Church is a society, representing the mind of Christ, it will express His unity in elucidating His truth with the utmost possible clearness. Unity, in other words, is not to be attained by the sacrifice of definitions, but by the increase of them. The means of it is neither vagueness nor inertia, but moral effort and intellectual keenness. This will be firstly for the individual; but since the individual churchman both gives to and receives from other members of the Church, the Church will, where possible, identify herself as a society with conclusions attained by effort and illumination, and she certainly must do so when contrary principles threaten danger either to herself or to the world.

Likewise with regard to function: so organized that she may give to all the members the good of each, herself a

supernatural unity, the Church will meet the daily opportunity, the sudden crisis, so frequently recurring, with that organic and effective mind which enables her vast heterogeneity to exert an immediate influence as one society, and which, furthermore, will enable her as a society to receive the immediate guidance which the mind of Christ gives to the skilled instrument of His body. She will be closely knit. And her diversity of operations will be guided by one spirit, which will be expressed by an organization in which one governing mind will be able to reach every individual. It is by this arrangement of delegated power that God expresses His unity in the variety of creation.

But since the Spirit of Christ, in the orthodox view, functions in inspiring both reason and human instruments, the sacramental principle will require for the unity of the Church a delegate of the unifying governance of God, a representative of His paternity. Such is the Catholic view of the Church: reasoned, effective, sacramental unity. The Church is founded on the Rock of Peter. The case here stated is that of a Roman Catholic, but it is a case stated openly and honestly on the principles of orthodox sacramentalism in a desire to clear the issue of cant, of sentimentalism, of platitude, and to turn to full advantage the great and increasing

interest the subject awakens in our days.

There are several reasons why with this fullness and this plainness one puts the logical arguments before Anglicans at the present moment. One is, as we began by saying, that at the moment the insidiousness of generalizing too loosely is catching many; one is that while the Church of England in its approaches towards dissent has been offered federation for unity, it has been offered at Malines a fuller enquiry into the essential nature of unity; one again is that when the results of the conversations have been leading the inaugurator to put forward his case with the logic, the eloquence and the piety which have made him the most influential layman in the Church of England, his arguments have sometimes been dismissed as the enthusiasm of an extremist without the profound examination which they invite. And yet another is that, at the moment, circumstances have tended to free Englishmen from the prejudice of centuries: "Is there any reason to think that Papal infallibility means more from the Church than we Englishmen unquestioningly accord to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, or to the King's signature when he completes an Act of Parliament?" A very well-known Anglican Bishop once asked that question of the present writer, and then the Bishop put it another way:

"Does not the unity of society demand that its final authority shall be unquestionable?" Then he gave it his own answer: "I think it does."

But there is yet another reason why at this moment one speaks with uncompromising clearness of the argument which relates orthodoxy to unity. It is a very suggestive disposition of circumstances in Church history. On the one hand, we see everywhere what Herr Piper argued in his book Weltliches Christentum, that the subjective individualism which Luther substituted for faith in the Church leads logically away from organized worship. In Lutheran Germany churches are so empty that in a town of twenty thousand people there is sometimes no service on a Sunday morning, and that one can drive round Berlin for an hour at eleven on a Sunday morning without finding a church open. It is not that Germany is heathen: but subjective individualism finds its inspiration in what naturally interests, delights, or thrills it, whether the guest, the poem, the social reform, Oriental mysticism, the dance, or the swim. And what is evident in Germany is not unfamiliar in Scandinavia, Great Britain, or America. It is common enough in the Catholic countries themselves. And in the countries of the Greek Church religion, formerly administered under the domain of the civil power, has been disorganized and weakened, so that there too there is a strong tendency in the same direction. Modernism—the Pope called it laicism—the religion of not going to church, is the most favoured form of worship. Yet, on the other hand, the constructiveness of orthodoxy, the claim of sacramentalism, is stronger than ever before. Orthodoxy and modernism, in fact, face one another in the ordered line of battle up and down Christendom, dans the Thom

And, at this moment, there are signs of a great historic reorganization in the heart of Rome itself. In the Middle Ages, the Papacy was above all concerned with the unity of Christendom and the unity of secular society under the dominance of Christendom. But it was also deeply interested in philosophy, and in literary and artistic culture. Then in the seething up-rush of life which gave us the fervid genius of the sixteenth century, it found that secularism, both in politics and in the humanistic view of life, had rushed from the unifying control of the Christian idea. And the Church in fervour and in more rigid definition attempted to renew her vigour in reform. For three centuries her peculiarity was her intransigence. But the Popes are now leading her from concentrating on her prerogatives to making them the salt of the world. Between the Popes of the Syllabus and of Pascendi Gregis, who repudiated the errors of the age, was another, who in a series of profound encyclicals established a reform of civil society, and his principles are those which are now being applied by the successor of the Pope of Peace. "Pax Christi in Regno Christi," the motto of the present Pope, reminds us that the Papacy is now busy in moral, social, economic reconstruction, is taking sweeping measures for Christian reunion on generous lines, and for the conversion of non-Christians into the Divine society. The Vatican is replacing the prestige of temporal power by that which accrues to her wherever the benefits of her function are recognized. And she offers a great and detailed scheme in adapting to the present age of shortened space and universal commerce the massive structure of Christian Aristotelianism. Constructive, energetic, ordered throughout its society and luminous, Catholicism presents the antithesis to that vague cloudiness, that preoccupation with natural things, that contented absorption in human activity, which offer us the interests and impulses of the hour for the light and grace which came with Jesus Christ. The issue is becoming daily clearer. If the subject of Church unity is treated as largely, as generously, as precisely as it deserves, we are already inside the gates of a crowded and gorgeous avenue of Church history. R. E. GORDON GEORGE.

P.S.—This article was written before either the Malines report or the new Papal encyclical on unity was published; but its writer, who gratefully welcomes both, believes that in this essay the two will be seen to amplify each other.

FAITH AND ORDER*

Canon Bate may be congratulated on the achievement of producing such a report as this within four months of the close of the Conference. It is no small task to reproduce so quickly the results of nineteen days' hard talking, in a volume of reasonable size, without showing signs either of haste or of extreme compression; especially when it is remembered that two-thirds of the matter needed translation into English. Yet the volume contains all, or almost all, that could well be asked for, in an attractive and readable form, and there are very few

^{*} Proceedings of the World Conference, Lausanne, 1927. Edited by H. N. Bate. S.C.M. 10s. 6d.

slips even in proof-reading. Indeed, almost the only one noticed by the reviewer is the remarkable description of Professor Alivisatos as Bishop of Manchester! The translation usually reads like an original, except for a few slips like "the two first," which occurs more than once. The omissions appear to be judicious: all the principal speeches are reported verbatim; and if only Canon Bate had printed somewhere in the book certain material prepared by the Subjects Committee, referred to more than once as "Pamphlet 52," we should never once feel that any part of the speeches called for explanations which are not in our hands. The very pettiness of such criticisms is the best negative testimony to the competence with which the Editor has fulfilled his task.

The actual and tangible results of the Conference are to be found in the Preamble and the six reports which are printed at the end of the volume. It is important to observe that under the rules of procedure by which the gathering was governed no report could be "accepted" unless it was passed nemine contradicente. If the voting was unanimous, the resolution was said to be "adopted." On the other hand, where there was actual opposition it was merely "received." There were thus at least three different degrees of support accorded to resolutions which were put to the vote: actually it seems that we can draw still finer distinctions from the

course of the debate.

1. The Preamble alone, drawn up by Bishop Brent, the President of the Conference, seems to have had strictly unanimous support, and was therefore formally "adopted."

2. It is not quite clear whether the report on "The Call to Unity" was "adopted" or not. From the course of the debates we should gather that it was merely "received," but on p. 460 it is stated that it was "unanimously adopted."

3. Report II. on "The Church's Message to the World—the Gospel" was accepted with practically unanimous support.

4. The case is very different with Reports III., IV., V., and VI. The Orthodox on the one hand and the Society of Friends on the other, not to mention Mr. Athelstan Riley and those for whom he spoke, made it clear that while refraining from actual opposition they were quite unable to take any responsibility for the standpoint of these documents. These reports therefore do not in any sense represent an agreed policy, but are merely statements which the Conference was willing to recommend to the consideration of the Churches.

5. The final report on "The Unity of Christendom and the Relation thereto of Existing Churches" met with considerable opposition, and in consequence was not "accepted" at all,

but merely "received," and referred to the Continuation Committee.

The Conference therefore lent its whole weight only to the Preamble, and perhaps also to "The Call to Unity." Of these the Preamble is far the more important. It defines the scope of the Conference and makes it clear that its object was not to lay down the conditions of reunion, but to register the level of agreement and disagreement, and suggest lines which might lead to fuller agreement than that already attained. "The Call to Unity" is an innocuous but rather rhetorical document, which might perhaps have been more effective if, like the other reports, it had been passed through the mill of

a sectional committee.

The second report, on "The Church's Message to the World," is an impressive declaration, and an extraordinary encouragement to those who believe that unity is only possible where there is agreement on the fundamentals of theology. Here we have real agreement registered on something very much deeper than conventional lines. After the alteration of a serious ambiguity pointed out by the Archbishop of Armagh, and the insertion of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit at the suggestion of Bishop Gore, the report emerged as a balanced statement of the Catholic Gospel. It would have been worth holding the Conference for this result alone. In spite of the scandal of our divisions and the extraordinary differences in the way in which we practise our religion and in our conceptions of grace and of authority, it can no longer be said that we Christians are all preaching "a different Gospel." The Conference revealed a real community of thought in the foundation articles of the faith. Of course, there are qualifica tions to be made. The voice of advanced Modernism was almost silent. This is to be accounted for by the fact that no religious bodies were invited to send representatives unless their formularies seemed to bind them to theological and Christological orthodoxy: and among such bodies, which include the vast majority of Christendom, the revolutionaries are after all few in number. Nor, of course, should we be justified in assuming that this remarkable theological unanimity of itself rendered our divisions obsolete. The things which divide us are such as would make general intercommunion distressing and unreal. But the incheate unanimity of the Conference does seem to bear witness to a return of Northern Europe to an interest and belief in the fundamentals of Christian theology. This is no more than might perhaps have been gathered from the reports, already published in THEOLOGY, of the symposium of German and English theologians at Canterbury last year. But it is reassuring to have

our impressions verified on this far wider scale.

After the second report real agreement ceases. Not only did the Orthodox and the Friends abstain from voting, but the reports themselves constantly call attention to differences which seem incapable of resolution. In the fifth report, on "The Ministry of the Church," they are actually the most prominent feature. In the text of the challenged seventh report, on the other hand, there is very little sign of disagreement. It was only when it reached the open Conference that it began to have a stormy passage, and on the last afternoon of the Conference Dr. Morehouse, the Editor of The Living Church, moved what was practically a hostile resolution. The final result, as we have already noticed, was the shelving of this report.

It remains to draw attention to some of the more notable

utterances of the Conference.

Four sentences from four different speeches may be read together, and perhaps give as clear an idea of the scope and tone of the Conference as could be compressed into so few words.

"It is for conference, not controversy, that we are called."

-Bishop Brent: Opening Sermon.

"The unity of the spirit must come before the unity of the body. . . . We have, I think, in the past, counted too much on settling our disputes by the method of inventing a formula or framing a scheme" (followed by a reference to the Lambeth proposals).—Archbishop of Armagh.

"This is a Conference about truth, not about reunion."-

Bishop of Bombay.

"Our purpose was" not to "define terms of reunion" or "make a statement of the Christian faith," but "to explore

lines of unity."—Bishop of Gloucester.

Another interesting comparison may be made between the speeches delivered by the Easterns at different stages of the Conference. Archbishop Germanos, speaking on "The Call to Unity," seemed prepared to minimize the requirements of the Orthodox Church and to confine them to the acceptance of the seven Œcumenical Councils. Archbishop Chrysostom two days later supplied the necessary complement (necessary at any rate for the due presentation of the Orthodox view) by pointing out that not only heresy, but also schism, cuts a man off from the true Church altogether. These statements were both made in the first week; but on the last day we find a far more uncompromising declaration from Professor Balanos incorporated in the rather unfortunate seventh report.

"The Greek Church, which regards the holy tradition of the Church besides the Holy Scriptures as norma fidei, cannot recognize liberty in regard to interpretation about sacramental

grace and ministerial order and authority."

The report on the Nature of the Church produced two great speeches from Dr. Parkes Cadman and the Bishop of Manchester. The former in a tone of the most admirable charity laid it down that all forms of polity must be only means and not ends, and went on to ask the question how a doctrine of an indispensable sacerdotal mediation could be adapted to the needs of a democratic age. The Bishop was concerned to emphasize the need of real agreement—not mere agreement to differ—not only on the Creed, but also on the Ministry and the Sacraments, and not least on the relation of Christ to the Church. Agreement on the last, he pointed out, might prove to be the path to unity on the others.

The debate on the Church's Confession of Faith brought the Anglican Episcopate into prominence. Bishop Gore pointed out that before there could be reunion it must be agreed—first, that there is an orthodoxy, a point which is hotly contested; and, secondly, that it is to be found in the two great Creeds. If that is agreed, then we can go forward towards complete reunion. If not, it is still possible to achieve a partial reunion, but not a reunion between Catholic and Protestant; and for the rest we must content ourselves with the attempt to consolidate all Christians on the basis of moral and social aims. The Bishop of Gloucester, desiring to conciliate those who, like Professor Wobbermin, wished to go behind the Creeds to the purely religious convictions underlying, produced a most ingenious formula, for which he asked the assent of the Conference: "We accept the faith . . . as it has been handed down to us in the Creed of the Catholic Church set forth at the Council of Chalcedon. . . . " By the time it had survived the sectional discussion Dr. Headlam's statement was not a little weakened. In the final report the function of the Creeds is "to witness to and safeguard" the faith of Christ.

In the discussion on the Church's Ministry very great importance attaches to the speech of the Bishop of Bombay. Strangely enough we hear nothing from him about the proposed schemes of reunion in South India. On the contrary, his contribution was a vehement defence of monarchical episcopacy, and of its necessity as the organ of priestly ordination. "The Church is not a democracy but a monarchy, and Christ is its King. All its institutions must be consonant

with and expressive of His sovereignty." It was left to Dr. Banninga to plead the cause of the non-episcopal ministries, a task which he performed with singular persuasiveness.

Dr. Souček's speech in the same discussion had the great merit of making it clear that it is not mere monarchical government which is pressed for on the Catholic side, but the

apostolic succession. To next a mi remot will relational

In the discussion on the Sacraments Dr. Vernon Bartlet is fresh and interesting, but he never really comes to grips with the teaching of St. Paul. Dr. Lang, of Halle, hits the nail on the head when he points out that what is at issue between Catholics and Protestants in this matter is a difference as to the nature of grace. Here is, it seems to the reviewer, a hopeful channel for discussion; for no one denies the Protestant idea of grace, which indeed corresponds closely to the New Testament use of the word. What is needed, therefore, is only the recognition that the Catholic idea is also true and biblical, even though it might have been better if a different word could have been found to express it.

Canon Quick, on the same subject, was, as ever, illumin-

ating and irenic. The state said a state of the state of

At the end of the second week of the Conference a desire begins to be expressed that the gathering ought not to close without a united Communion, and it is possible that this premature suggestion may have been responsible for a certain hardening of opinion which seems to show itself during the last week. This reached its climax in the rather harsh language in which Dr. W. E. Barton supported the adoption of the report on the Ministry on Wednesday afternoon, and in the declaration of the Orthodox, already referred to, on Thursday morning. But perhaps it was better that the air should be cleared, rather than that the Conference should run any danger of satisfying itself with ambiguities. Certainly the sectional gathering which had charge of the fifth report seems to have taken the warning to heart. As presented on Wednesday the report was not only ambiguous, the word "order" being used in two different senses with a suggestion of a third, but also implied that "with care and patience," and a little more time, complete agreement could have been reached on the subject of the Ministry! The second draft, presented on Saturday morning, was more sincere.

Perhaps the resulting convictions of the Conference could not be better summed up than in the words of Pastor Gounelle in his sermon at the closing service: "We need... the sacerdotal Church, which has done so much and so worthily for mankind, and stands for order and spiritual authority. But also . . . we need the prophetic Church . . . which, while it awaits the eternal reign of God, shall be the unwearied builder of the social kingdom of Jesus Christ.

K. D. MACKENZIE.

THE ANGLICAN DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH

the true Church, and that all the ather secretics are advancing

societies into which the Characters split some one muse

claims which carmot be allowed. Forther, if it had to

ROMAN Catholic critics of the Anglican position, and too many apologists for that position, are apt to assume that the issues involved can be approached on the basis of a considerable measure of agreement as to the nature of the Church and as to the nature of the Church's authority in matters of doctrine. In fact, fundamental differences of view are involved; the two positions follow logically in either case from basal conceptions which are radically opposed; and Anglican attempts to meet Roman criticism while accepting conceptions of the Church and of doctrinal authority similar to those of Roman Catholic theologians, are no less forced and unconvincing than are attempts to justify the Roman position on the basis of a liberal Catholicism. The object of this note is to indicate very briefly some of those ultimate differences of view which lie behind the two positions, and to defend, still more briefly, certain conceptions which appear to justify Anglo-Catholicism.

Almost all Roman Catholic theologians, and many Anglican theologians, tend to think of the Church as a society founded by our Lord in His incarnate life, and to assume that this conception gives a sufficiently accurate account of the nature of the Church to provide an adequate basis for the discussion of its unity and continuity. The Lady Margaret Professor in the University of Oxford has used the case of the Franciscan movement to show that a single society might issue in two or more societies, no one of which had the right to claim to be the one true embodiment of the original movement. Dr. Williams' argument gives very serious pause to the Roman conclusions even on the basis of regarding the Church as analogous to a society. But the force which his argument possesses turns on the assumption that institutional unity is not more fundamental in the case of the Christian Church than in the case of the Franciscan movement. If (as is admitted) we are bound to assert that the Church must possess an actual unity, and if for the purposes of the discussion the Church can adequately be thought of as a society, the Roman conclusion is in the long run inevitable. If the unity of the Church may be regarded as analogous to the unity of a society, and if we are committed to the view that the Church must ever preserve its essential unity, then the only possible conclusion is that of the various societies into which the Church has split some one must be the true Church, and that all the other societies are advancing claims which cannot be allowed. Further, if it had to be conceded that some one of the existing Churches is and is alone the true Church, he would be a bold controversialist, or a great pessimist, who gave that title to any other body than the Roman Catholic Church.

If this be correct, then the fundamental issue is whether the Church is so analogous to a society as to render analogous the unity of the Church and the unity of such a society. At least one other possible analogy exists which implies equally the social character of the Church, but which involves a radically different conception of its essential unity, and does so without rendering this something which has no visible expression. It will presently be argued that this analogy, the analogy of a nation, is both closer to Holy Scripture and so much truer in itself as to afford the proper basis for argument. For the moment we are concerned with its implications. The unity of a race is something which in ideal circumstances should find expression in a single society, in a single state, but it is something which is logically antecedent to such institutional unity, which may and does persist in spite of the loss of such institutional unity, and which (even so) is not merely invisible but finds expression, for example, in common language, common traditions and ideals, and common customs. The partition or disruption of a state, which previously expressed the common life of a race, weakens the expression of that common life, but the race remains one. Its essential unity persists and on the lines which have been indicated this may, and in general will, have visible expression.

The bearing of the analogy is obvious. If the Church is more accurately thought of as a race, as the New Israel, than as a society, then its essential unity is antecedent to and does not necessarily involve, even although ideally it should lead to, institutional unity. It is the case that this analogy is more closely related to New Testament thought than is the analogy of a society. Text after text, passage after passage, may be adduced which assert or immediately imply the conception of the Church as the New Israel. And on the crucial point, that of an essential unity which determines

rather than is determined by institutional unity, it corresponds far more closely to the scriptural emphasis on the individual possession of and participation in a regenerate and supernatural life. Much play is made by Roman Catholic controversialists with that description of the Church, other than as the New Israel, which finds most expression in the New Testament and which has at least equal importance. Argument from the conception of the Church as the mystical Body to the Roman conclusions as to the impossibility of any breach in institutional unity with the Holy See depends, however, on a use of analogies which does not bear analysis. It assumes not merely that the Papacy is an important organ in our Lord's mystical body as it exists on earth, which may well be conceded, but that breach of communion with the Holy See is analogous to physical severance, say, from the heart, so that a separated limb is no longer in any real sense part of the body. This assumed analogy between breach of communion and physical severance from an important organ is at once essential to the argument and indefensible. A separated limb ceases to be part of the body in any real sense, because the effect of separation is that the personality in question no longer animates the limb. The history of the Eastern Churches under persecution, or of the Catholic revival in the Church of England, or of Christian piety in many Protestant bodies, invalidates the analogy by making clear that breach of communion with the Holy See does not involve separation from the indwelling Christ even when the breach of communion is long standing. One last piece of New Testament evidence deserves notice. The high-priestly prayer for unity is a prayer for a unity which will be evidential of the supernatural. It corresponds well to a conception of unity which regards Christian unity as issuing from a supernatural life shared by the regenerate. It corresponds very ill with the natural unity of a society. As has been well said, "There are some people who say the plate can't be broken because the bit which has got P on it is always the whole plate." When the Roman theology of the Church was in process of formulation, thought was for long governed by forensic conceptions; and these affected deeply men's conceptions both of the State and of the Church. In regard to both, but pre-eminently in regard to the Church, there resulted false simplifications. The facts demand more philosophic, more mystical and thus more adequate treatment.

Such a view of Christian unity as has been indicated implies that all the regenerate share in that unity in and through their participation in a common supernatural life. It affords grounds also for the frank admission that any community which expresses the corporate religious life of a body of Christians may in a very real sense be termed a Church. On the other hand, it does not follow that all such communities offer a legitimate allegiance to the fully informed. Having regard to particular texts and to the New Testament evidence as a whole, it is difficult to reach any other conclusions than that the Apostles governed the Church in virtue of these commissions from our Lord—that our Lord instituted a superimposed government having authority to claim allegiance in His name. If so, then, quite apart from the question as to what forms this government may have taken at any particular moment in the past, or may take in the future, there remains an obligation to whatever government has evolved from the Apostolic government by continuous sanction. The claim which must be made for episcopal government turns in the last resort, not on the question as to whether the Apostolic commission was continuously committed by tradition of hands, but on the fact that the Apostolic government modified itself by the continuous sanction (or direction) of the government existing at any moment into a localized episcopate and on the fact that the episcopate as a whole has not recognized the right of a particular Church to abolish Bishops. Nor is this insistence on the importance of preserving a government continuous with the original superimposed government merely a duty which has no obvious value. Such a government, and recognition of the duty to preserve it, afford the strongest possible witness to our belief in an historic Incarnation and in the unique and supernatural authority of Him from whom the Apostles received their commission, who walked on earth as man but was yet Very God.

The question remains as to what authority such a view demands for patriarchates, and especially for the Holy See, as elements in the developed government either merely as developments of that government, or, in the case of the Holy See, as a development of a particular element in the original government. In the West we are concerned only with the case of the Holy See. It is impossible to deny that the Papacy received very considerable authority by continuous and general sanction at least as a matter of development. The present writer is not prepared to deny that it sholds a position which is a development of a real primacy possessed by Peter. On the other hand, few things are more striking than the contrast between the unanimity of sanction

by which the apostolate was gradually transformed into a local episcopate and the divisions wrought in the Church's government by the enhancement of the Papal claims to their present level. A monarchical and infallible Papacy has not, and never had, behind it anything approaching to general sanction of the existing government of the Church. Nor do the New Testament and the history of the primitive Church allow room for the view that such a Papacy was an original element and is therefore independent of argument from the development of the Church's government as a whole. It would appear to follow that we are not bound to accept the present claims of the Papacy, but that we are bound both to be prepared ex animo to accept considerable claims if the present claims were reduced, and to give very great weight to the Holy See, and to its teaching, in so far as this is not clearly vitiated by excessive elements in its present claims.

Such an element exists in the claim of the Holy See to exercise what is in essence a monarchical authority, since this can legitimately be based neither on development by continuous sanction of the Church's government as a whole nor on original existence. Another element is afforded by the Roman conception of the Church. Yet another, that of the present character of the claim to infallibility, is in practice even more important. Even were the claim limited to the assertion of infallibility when the Holy See is giving expression to a pre-existing consensus in the Church, the claim would be incapable of being accepted so long as the Church is defined as consisting only of those in communion with that See. Nor is that the whole or even the main difficulty. The whole conception of an "oracular" authority is open to very grave objection in itself and in the light of New Testament teaching. It is argued (since almost admittedly no text establishes more than indefectibility) that God could not have left us without infallible guidance. That type of argument in which man presumes to judge how God must act. and to apply the canon decuit: ergo fecit, would become tolerable if, but only if, we could honestly say that we would expect much which God undeniably allows in other directions. Further, the claim made for guidance by the Church in the field of intellect has had to be narrowed in view of the advance of secular knowledge. A claim to give intellectual guidance which is not confirmed, but, having been made, has to be thrown over in part of its alleged field as a result of the advance of other knowledge is a claim which at the least is open to very grave suspicion. Such criticism might easily be developed at greater length; but the truth would appear to

be not merely that it is difficult to adduce satisfactory arguments to establish any "infallible oracle," but that there is in the New Testament a positive conception of doctrinal authority which points in a different direction. The whole range of thought which finds its most characteristic expression in the text: "If any man willeth to do His will, he shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God" (John vii. 17) points to an empirical criterion of truth largely foreign to Latin theology and certainly inconsistent with its developed theory of "oracular" authority. Men may like or dislike the appeal to experience as the main ground for doctrine. It is very difficult to deny that it is this appeal to which the

Scriptures direct us.

If the conclusion to which this points is out of keeping with later thought, it is scarcely too much to say that of all Christian systems Anglo-Catholicism is that which can more easily, and should more gladly, base its conception of authority on such empiricism. Anglo-Catholicism is always being accused of an eclectic selection between traditional Roman Catholic doctrines. It will be found that those it takes are doctrines very closely related to devotional experience, those it rejects, or sits lightly to, have been developed in the excogitation of intellectual systems, or in the desire to afford support for doctrines which needed no such support, having sufficient evidence of their truth in their proved value. Again, Anglo-Catholics are continually being attacked on the ground that the Anglican Church is very tolerant of strange opinions. A consensus must, however, be a free consensus if it is to be impressive in regard to facts of experience or in regard to inferences from such facts. A central authority securing agreement by repression or exclusion is a natural corollary to an oracular theory of authority. From the alternative point of view a policy of repression or exclusion, so far from strengthening the authority for particular beliefs, cuts at the very roots of all rational authority. And if it be urged that such a view turns theology into an empirical science, and opens the possibility that even our fundamental beliefs may be set aside, it may well be replied in regard to the latter point, that, for example, the doctrine of the Incarnation could only be set aside if (as we believe, per impossibile) some doctrine which treated our Lord as merely man proved a better guide in leading men to God; and, in regard to the former point, that we can scarcely advance better the claims of theology than by showing that it is entitled at least to the respect with which men have learnt to treat the empirical sciences. WILL SPENS.

THE WORLD INTO WHICH CHRISTIANITY CAME: II.—THE WORLD OF GREEK THOUGHT

In one of the noblest passages of exalted patriotism ever written, Virgil draws a contrast between the imperial mission of his own people, and the artistic, oratorical, and scientific accomplishments of "others." He refers here to the manifold genius of the Greek world; and no Roman knew better than he what its value was. Virgil himself is among the great ones of all time; but without Theocritus, Hesiod, and Homer his poetry would have taken a very different form from that in which it has been cherished and enjoyed for two thousand years. The world into which Virgil came, in fact, was not merely the world which Rome had conquered, but a world in which the conquering power had itself been led captive by Greek culture. Horace's well-known line tells no more than the truth:

"Gracia capta ferum victorum cepit."

The Roman genius was essentially practical; its strength lay in law, warfare, and organization; Rome conquered, ruled, and unified the world. But its artistic, scientific, and philesophical studies were never home grown; they were exotic plants, imported from Greece. The roll of Roman philosophers is short and not eminent; we cannot claim much originality in this sphere for Cicero, Seneca, or M. Aurelius. But it was the Roman Empire which made Greek culture universally influential. And by the beginning of the Christian era the average Roman had a higher appreciation for Greek art than was common 150 years before, if Mummius, the conqueror of Greece, may be taken as a fair example.

Greece, may be taken as a fair example.

But we have to go back behind the conquests of Rome in tracing the spread of Greek ideas throughout the world; back to the work of Alexander. When he came to his father's throne, Greece was politically hopeless. The murder of Philip of Macedon had removed an obnoxious master, but it conferred neither unity nor liberty upon the Greeks; for Alexander's accession gave them a new master. But this time it was a master whose conquests "opened all the world to their talents" (Mahaffy). Alexander died before his thirty-third birthday, and his military achievements attracted so much attention at the time that his amazing political genius was not

^{*} A lecture delivered at the Vecation Term for Biblical Study held at Cambridge in August, 1927.

adequately recognized. But his work for civilization, i.e. Hellenization, struck deep and permanent root. As a type and focus of it we may take the cities which he founded in the East, and equipped with mixed populations of Greek, Macedonian, and Oriental inhabitants side by side. The one which bears his name is the best example and the most important for the

study of Christian origins. Let testinos a amenb light / motified

Alexandria was the metropolis of that liberal Judaism which characterized the Jews of the Dispersion. These Jews were settled in all countries bordering the Mediterranean, and were brought of necessity into far closer contact with Greek civilization than had ever been possible in their native land. This civilization not only appealed to their imagination as a new opportunity for the spread of their religion, but also widened their own intellectual and cultural outlook. The preparation of the Septuagint version of the Old Testament is sufficient in itself to show how far the liberalizing process had advanced within half a century of Alexander's death. It was among the Jews of the Dispersion, again, that the class of "God-fearers," whom we meet in the Acts of the Apostles, sprang up; these were thoughtful Gentiles who were attracted by the monotheistic faith and pure morals of Israel, though still holding back from circumcision. The need of such men received in due course from Christianity the full satisfaction which Judaism could not give; here as elsewhere the new faith entered upon an inheritance prepared for it by the old. The contact of Jew and Greek throughout the Dispersion had made ready for the Church both a band of broader-minded Jews, and a less well defined, but very numerous, body of Gentiles sympathetically affected towards the People of God. And this contact was a direct result of the Hellenizing policy of Alexander.

From Alexandria and the Hellenized Judaism of the Dispersion we may now betake ourselves to Rome-Rome of the early second century A.D. We have noticed already the receptiveness of the Imperial capital, and that ideas travelled thither more quickly than anything else. It was crowded with teachers and philosophers, some genuine, some charlatans, and even the Athenian eagerness to hear or tell some new thing would have found itself equalled, if not surpassed, at Rome. There lived there, at the period we are considering, a certain Justin, known to us now as St. Justin Martyr, and the most notable of early Christian Apologists. But we are concerned here, not with his life as a Christian, but with the preliminary stages of his spiritual pilgrimage; his search for truth in the various philosophical systems which belonged to

the world of Greek thought.

Justin himself gives a brief sketch of this quest at the beginning of his Dialogue with Trypho. He sat first, he tells us, at the feet of a certain Stoic, but left him after a considerable time without having acquired any further knowledge of God; the man lacked this knowledge himself, adds Justin, and said such instruction was unnecessary. Justin's next master was a philosopher of the Peripatetic school, which represented the Aristotelian tradition, and a man of the world into the bargain. After entertaining his would-be disciple for some days, he invited him to settle the fee, "in order that their intercourse might not be unprofitable." So Justin left him forthwith, believing him, as he remarks, to be no philosopher at all. He transferred himself now to a Pythagorean, a man very famous and not unconscious of his fame. But the first interview was unpromising. Justin was asked whether he was acquainted with music, astronomy, and geometry. "Do you expect," asked the pundit, "to perceive any of those things which conduce to a happy life, if you have not first been informed on those points which wean the soul from sensible objects, and render it fit for objects which appertain unto the mind? ... Having commended many of these branches of learning, and telling me that they were necessary," concludes Justin, "he dismissed me when I confessed to him my ignorance." and included a little and a second of the

Justin's next master was a Platonist, and kinder. Under him the aspiring philosopher made rapid progress; "in a little while," he says, "I supposed that I had become wise; and, such was my stupidity, I expected forthwith to look upon

God, for this is the end of Plato's philosophy."

It was at this stage of Justin's career that his conversion to Christianity took place, and there seems no doubt that his training in the school of Plato had helped to put him in the right frame of mind. It was by his Platonist teacher alone that he had been led to expect to look upon God; with this hope in his mind he stumbled upon the Prophets, and through them was led to contemplate the Christ Whom they foretold.

To follow Justin further is beyond our present purpose; our task now is to return to the earlier stages of his search for truth, and see briefly what was offered him by the world of Greek thought, as represented by the systems to which he

betook himself.

If we give our first and main attention to Stoicism, we are following not the logical order of a treatise on the history

^{*} Space forbids treatment of Epicureanism and Scepticism; for these, and for the whole of the present subject, see Dr. Bevan's Later Greek Religion (Dent, 5s.). In the following account of Stoicism I am much indebted to Drummond's Philo Judaus.

of philosophy, but still a very practical order. For Stoicism was the dominant school of thought when Christianity came into the world, and it was to Stoicism, as we have seen, that Justin turned first of all in his quest for the truth. Nor was its influence a new thing in his time. We remember St. Paul's encounter with Stoics and Epicureans at Athens; but we easily forget that Stoicism flourished strongly in his own native city of Tarsus. Acute critics have found many elements of Stoicism in St. Paul's own intellectual outlook; but these are easily exaggerated, and it is certainly rash to

lay great stress on his quotation from Aratus.

Stoicism is not a speculative system of high originality like the systems of Plato and Aristotle. Speculative of course it was; but its predominant character sprang from the new attention which it gave to human needs. It was primarily a practical philosophy, concerned not only deeply, but chiefly, with ethical and religious problems. The remoteness of Aristotle's deity from the life of men was to the Stoics profoundly unsatisfying; by contrast they sought to find divine reason and wisdom in the universe. Here the ordered beauty of the world appealed to them strongly, and gave force to the teleology which they had inherited from Plato and Aristotle. A somewhat curious use of syllogisms reinforced their conclusions; the following, which came from Zeno (c. 336-263) himself, the founder of the Stoic school, are noted by Drummond. "That which uses reason," he said, "is better than that which does not use reason; but nothing is better than the universe; therefore the universe uses reason." Again: "Of nothing that is without sense can any part be sentient; but parts of the universe are sentient; therefore the universe is not without sense." These and similar arguments were held to establish the existence of God, though their pantheistic trend is sufficiently clear. The Stoics appealed also to the argument a consensu gentium which still holds a place in evidences for Theism; less satisfactory was a further appeal to so-called historical evidences for the appearances of God, and to divinations and portents of which the validity was not questioned. To the divine reason which orders the harmonious universe they gave the name of the Logos.

It is something of a shock at this stage to be reminded that the Stoics were materialists. They held that whatever had causal power must be corporeal; corporeal in the strict sense of a three-dimensional body. Therefore even God Himself, or the Logos, Who is not distinguished from God, must

amonati stall

not merely have, but be, a body; the purest kind of body indeed, but still a body. They also spoke of God as spirit, but this did not mean more than matter attenuated to the point at which it becomes like air. Origen uses of the Stoic belief a phrase which makes an exact antithesis to the Pauline σῶμα πνευματικόν, spiritual body; he says that the Stoics regarded the Logos as πνεύμα σωματικόν, corporeal spirit. This corporeal spirit pervades all things, mean and noble alike; a conception which is seen at its finest in the hymn of Cleanthes. And it not only pervades but administers the universe.

Yet this administration is not the work, as we should naturally suppose, of a personal divinity, shaping our ends. Cleanthes speaks of Zeus, in his hymn, as the possessor of many names, and Chrysippus, who made Stoicism into a system (third century B.C.), allows the Logos to be spoken of as Destiny, Truth, Cause, Nature, Necessity, and so on. Seneca in the same spirit approves of the titles Fate, Providence, Nature, and the Universe. It is evident that this view of the world's governance raises sharply the problems of evil and pain. Here the Stoic floundered. Stress was laid on the disciplinary value of adversity; and the word "stoical" in its ordinary modern use denotes the firmest possible spirit of endurance. But this was not enough, and the Stoic was reduced finally to the ignoble solution that in whatever straits we may be we are still left by God with the will and the power to extricate ourselves from the tangle of existence by suicide. This is evidently a doctrine of despair; theoretically as unsatisfactory as it can be, and practically not a facing of the facts, but a refusal to face them. Christianity came into a world in which the Stoic approval of suicide was the product of the best thought of the most thoughtful minds, and the contrast between the Stoic and the Christian view is radical and needs no elaboration.

Before we leave Stoicism there is one more feature which must be touched on briefly because of its subsequent influence on Christian exegesis, especially in the Alexandrine school. This was the method of allegorism. It came to the Alexandrine fathers through Philo, but Philo himself was indebted for it to the Stoics, who were its most thoroughgoing exponents. The reason for its adoption was plain enough. The cultured philosophers could not accept the crude and gross mythology of current paganism, but they were most unwilling to disturb the traditional orthodoxy which enshrined it. They faced the problem with great

^{*} Printed in Bevan, op. oit., p. 14.

THE WORLD LYTO

ingenuity, and refusing to employ surgical methods they applied strong medicines to the patient. They left the myths in their old place, but without altering a line of them they turned them into allegories. A fanciful and wholly unscientific etymology was employed to assist this edifying process, especially with reference to the divine names and titles. Hermes, thus treated, emerges as the Logos, and practically no transformation is beyond the power of a determined allegorism.

We turn now to Pythagoreanism. The sixth-century founder of the school, or rather schools, which bore his name is one of the most remarkable men in history. "It is certain," writes an eminent authority, "that Pythagoras is entitled to be called the father of science, and it becomes more and more clear that all European religion and ethics, so far as they do not originate in Palestine, can also be traced back to him.' But the Pythagoreans who flourished at the beginning of the Christian era were less illustrious. Their chief claim on our attention lies in the fact that they were ardent Hellenists and pagans; champions of the old pagan ways in thought and religion, and within those limits extremely eclectic. The challenge of Christianity pressed them hard, and they made an effort somewhat in the spirit subsequently exhibited by Julian to revive Paganism by remodelling it on Christian lines. Unlike Julian, however, it was not a new organization for the present which they attempted, but a new exposition of the past. They saw the immense attraction exercised on Christians, and on thoughtful pagans, by the person and historic life of Christ, and they determined to equip Paganism with the like attractions. So the already shadowy figure of Pythagoras himself was invested with features borrowed from the New Testament portrait of Christ, and finally in the life of Apollonius we have a full-blown Messianic romance composed as a counterblast to the Gospel story.* Apollonius himself was an historical character of the first century, and apparently a religious reformer. But the third-century life of him composed by Philostratus, at the instigation of Julia Domna, is not a biography but a romance. His birth was divinely foretold to his mother; he entered on his mission at the age of sixteen; he lived in poverty and chastity, and kept the Pythagorean law of five years' silence; he spoke with authority in a way which inspired awe; he dwelt in temples, especially those of the healing-god Æsculapius, like a child in his father's house. He wandered throughout the Hellenic world with a band of disciples more loyal than quick of

^{*} For the following account of Apollonius see Bigg's Christian Platonists of Alexandria. * Friendskin Blavan, op. off., p. 14.

apprehension; he healed diseases and raised the dead. He met with priestly opposition but popular favour, and to his influence was due the downfall of tyrants like Nero and Domitian, and the elevation of such good Emperors as

Vespasian and Nerva.

So much for the active life of Apollonius; the next scene is his passion. Domitian was persecuting the philosophers; Apollonius, setting aside the fears of his disciples, went to Rome to offer himself as a sacrifice to the Emperor. A false charge was brought against him; he was reviled and imprisoned, and scornfully challenged to save himself, if he could, by a miracle. But beyond this stage the passion is not allowed to go. Apollonius was spirited away from the judgment seat, and showed himself forthwith to two of his disciples who were lamenting his loss. One of the two, unable to believe his eyes, was reassured by a handclasp. This is not the end; Apollonius seems to have resumed his former way of life for a time, and finally, after a further miraculous deliverance from prison, was translated to immortality amid the welcoming salutations of an angelic band.

This narrative is, as Dr. Bigg remarks, "the story of the Gospel corrected and improved. Apollonius is what the enlightened circle of Julia Domna thought Christ ought to have been. His portrait is copied with minute care from that of the Son of Mary, but it has been adorned and dignified according to heathen notions." We observe that the Cross of our Lord was still, as in St. Paul's day, foolishness to the Greeks; the Gnostics and Celsus reveal in their different ways the same attitude towards it. Julia Domna's husband, the Emperor Septimius Severus, was well spoken of by Tertullian, and does not seem to have been a bigoted opponent of the Church, in spite of the considerable persecutions which took place in his reign (192-211); while her nephew, Alexander Severus (222-235), included a bust of Christ in his private chapel, together with those of Abraham, Apollonius, and Orpheus: betain vinietree been viewe ad of fem at vaccional muc

The eclecticism of Alexander Severus reflects a general tendency of contemporary paganism. The original systems of Plato and Aristotle are definitely and most significantly distinct from each other; but in the third century A.D. the Peripatetics, who were the guardians of the Aristotelian tradition, came to be absorbed, along with other philosophical schools, in the Neo-Platonist movement. Aristotelianism has played an immensely important part in Christian thought, but its full impact was not felt until the time of the Schoolmen. The Peripatetic sage approached by St. Justin does

11

not create a favourable impression. Peripatetics were doing a valuable work from about 70 B.C. onwards, after a long period of decline, but this was chiefly in the way of editing and expounding the writings of Aristotle rather than in maintaining a definite philosophical position derived from him, though Alexander Aphrodisiensis, head of the school under Septimius Severus, was a notable thinker of some originality, who won the respect of Plotinus. A hungry soul, however, like Justin's found no satisfaction in the Peripatetics of the second century. Nor indeed would he have found it in the authentic teaching of Aristotle himself; for though his doctrine of God falls under the category of "transcendent theism," and God Himself is spoken of as the "prime mover," the real connection between God and the world is shadowy in the extreme. The Deity is left contemplating His own perfection in practical isolation from the universe, with no opening for communion between Him and the human spirit.

The appeal of Plato to the religious mind was always far deeper than that of Aristotle. It was as a master of method rather than as an exponent of results that Aristotle was valued and used by the Schoolmen; but Plato ranked as a religious teacher, and the debt both of Philo and the Christian Alexandrines to him is very great. Justin, as we have seen, shows higher appreciation of his Platonist teacher than of any other; and he gives Socrates as one example of the great and good men of old time who have lived nobly under the inspiration of the Logos. Clement of Alexandria speaks of the "truth-loving Plato," and with generous insight regards Philosophy as having accomplished for the Gentiles the same kind of function as the Law fulfilled for the Jews; it was a schoolmaster to lead them to Christ. In this part of the world preparation for the Incarnation Plato is to Clement more or less the counterpart of Moses, though the description of him as an "Attic Moses" comes from the second-century Neo-Platonist Numenius of Apamea. Plato's own theology is not to be easily and certainly stated; but he seems to have ascribed personality to God, and probably we are to accept the identification of God with the Idea of the Good, which in Plato's system is the highest of eternal realities, and the ultimate cause of all phenomenal existence. There was much here which necessarily appealed to the philosophic Christian.

But the world into which Christianity came was far removed from Plato himself. The Platonic tradition was carried on by the Academics, as the Aristotelian was by the Peripatetics; but the stream was running very thin by the

THE WORLD INTO WHICH CHRISTIANITY CAME 151

time the Christian era began. Its last leader of any note, Antiochus of Ascalon (first century B.C.), "held that all Stoic doctrines were to be found in Plato, and that the differences of the Peripatetics and Stoics from the Academy were merely verbal." After this comes a long blank, as is natural in any traditional school of philosophy when eclecticism gains the day; and Neo-Platonism, though it received its impulse from the master's own teaching, arose quite independently of the Academic school, and did not even secure a footing within it

until the fifth century A.D.

At the time, therefore, with which we are especially concerned, even the greatest of the Greek philosophical systems -the Platonic and the Aristotelian-no longer appealed to thinking men with cogent force. There was a general air of failure and despair abroad, the feeling that truth could not be attained, nor any sure path towards it discerned. It is no matter either for wonder or reproach that Greek thought produced no further philosophical teachers equal to Plato and Aristotle, for the world has not yet succeeded in accomplishing that. But the deeply significant feature of the situation was that even these pre-eminent masters proved inadequate to the spiritual needs of man. Brilliant speculation, acute criticism, subtle investigation, an open-eyed search for truth, all these great qualities were present in the works of Plato and Aristotle; but the felt defect was this-that their results were not founded upon a rock. So there was no sure and certain hope, no steadfast anchor of the soul, "entering into that within the veil"; Stoics in the last resort were not very much superior to Sceptics and Epicureans in this regard. Thus in a strangely negative, but singularly impressive, way, the very greatness and the very achievements of Greek thought, by accentuating its inherent weakness and insufficiency, helped to prepare the way for the coming of Jesus Christ, in whom all the promises of God are yea, and through Whom is the Amen.

The state of the s

the state of the s

The state of the s

ERIC GRAHAM.

RELIGIOUS DEVELOPMENT FROM VESPASIAN TO TRAJAN

Dr. Henderson's earlier monographs on the history of the Roman Empire are well known. He closes a gap in the series with his new Five Roman Emperors,* which covers the period from Vespasian's accession to Trajan's death. Most of the book is occupied with a careful study of frontier policy and of economic conditions; at the same time the personalities of the Emperors are put in a clear perspective, and a spirited and persuasive rehabilitation of Domitian is given. Students will here find a comprehensive and fresh treatment of evidence which is largely hard of access. The whole is written in a vigorous style and with a good command of the literature on most points.† It should interest the general reader and at the same time be of service to professed students of antiquity. A detailed criticism of its subject-matter would lie outside the range of THEOLOGY; I propose instead to consider the religious history of this period in the light of recent study.

the grant with driving the contract H.

Nero's death had left Rome without a master, and the successive failures of Galba and Otho to establish their power had left her in the hands of Vitellius, whose unsuitability was obvious. When pressure was put upon Vespasian to try his chance he did well to yield to it. Yet he was a novus homo. The Julio-Claudian house, stained as it was with the criminal and un-Roman behaviour of Nero, retained some of the glamour of its lineage and of the memory of Augustus. If Vespasian was to succeed he would wish (or perhaps we should, in view of his sober nature, say that some in his entourage would wish him) to appear as a heaven-sent saviour, like Augustus. Signs and wonders met this need. In the Serapeum at Alexandria a

* Five Roman Emperors: Vespasian, Titus, Domitian, Nerva, Trajan, A.D. 69-117, by Bernard W. Henderson. Pp. xiii+357, with four maps. 1927. Cambridge

University Press. 21s. net. † An exception is the page on the Jewish troubles at Alexandria (p. 337), where reference should be made at least to H. I. Bell, Juden und Griechen im römischen Alexandreia; it may be added that insufficient use is made of the evidence of coins. I note in passing p. 94, 3, J. R. S., xxii. (should be xii.): p. 130, Fortuna Respiciens, "Backward-glancing Luck" (means "Fortune who regards human prayers," τύχη ἐπήκοος); p. 154, the "accursed gods," dii nefandi, are explained, perhaps rightly, as owing their epithet to the grief of the bereaved father (but it may be a genuine equivalent of Iranian "evil angels," as Cumont urges, Revue de l'histoire des religions, lxxii., 164, 2); p. 188, the discussion of the arch at Beneventum needs to be modified in view of G. A. Snyder's important paper, Arch. Jahrb., xli. (1926), 95 ff., which dates some of the reliefs as late Hadrianic.

cryptic oracle pointed to Vespasian's rule; Serapis also in dreams gave orders to a blind man and a lame man to go to the Emperor to be cured, and they were so cured. Vespasian shows the traits of the man who is more than human, the $\theta \in \cos a\nu\theta \rho\omega \pi \sigma s$ who as ruler, philosopher, or magician, is so important in the first three centuries of our era.* From another side Josephus, writing his Jewish Warst in a lodging in the house occupied by Vespasian before he was Emperor, and enjoying an Imperial pension, represents Vespasian as a divinely appointed ruler, fulfilling the current prophecy that a ruler of the world would come out of Judæa, and records how when a captive he learnt in a dream that Vespasian would so rule the world. The story he tells is very important; it is very possibly based on Vespasian's own commentarii; it certainly represents the story in the light in which Vespasian wished it to be told, and it is an answer to histories of the Jewish war already in circulation. A Jew could regard a Gentile ruler as divinely appointed; this we see particularly in Deutero-Isaiah 45 (concerning Cyrus), and in a strain in the Jewish literature of Alexandria which emphasized the divine sanction of Ptolemaic power.§ Further, Suetonius has a list of eleven portents marking Vespasian as destined to rule; parts of this appear in other historians, and the whole appears to be taken from a lost historical work by the elder Pliny, an intimate as well as a fellow-worker of the Emperor. In his Natural History Pliny speaks of his salutaris exortus in connection with the cessation of certain vexatious prosecutions.

Like Augustus, like earlier rulers, Vespasian is thus designated as a saviour from chaos. In his policy he looks back to Augustus from his successors. This he expressed in the normal way by his coinage; not merely such legends as Paci Avgvstæ and Libertas Restituta, but also many features from the money of Augustus (as for instance his natal sign Capricorn) appear on it.** Like Augustus he is honoured as "the preserver of public ceremonies and the restorer of sacred

^{*} Suet., Vesp., 7; Tac., Hist., iv., 81. On the ectos are powers if in general. O. Weinreich, Neue Jahrbücher, 1926, 633 ff.

[†] Completed between 75 and 79 A.D. ‡ I follow W. Weber's important Josephus und Vespasian (1921); for the reference to earlier historians see Antiq. Jud., i. 4.

[§] L. Cerfaux, Le Muséon, xxxvii. (1924), 29 ff. Note also the dedication of Jewish oratories in honour of Ptolemy III. and Berenice, and of Ptolemy VIII. and Cleopatra (Dittenberger, Orient. gr. inscr. sel., 726; Preisigke, Sammelbuch griech. Urk., 5862: a similar dedication recorded in Dittenberger 96, where it is not certain which Ptolemy is meant).

Suet., Vesp., 5; cf. A. B. Braithwaite's note ad loc., p. 29 ffs
Plin., Nat. hist., xxxiii., 41. Cf. in general my forthcoming Early Gentile
Christianity and its Hellenistic Background, p. 88 ff. (in Essays on the Trinity and the
Incarnation, ed. A. E. J. Rawlinson).

^{**} Mattingly-Sydenham, Roman Imperial Coinage, ii., 6, etc. Vespasian in his coinage associates his rule with Rome's great past as a whole.

temples."* His régime brought what Augustus had desired but not secured, plainer livingt; the extinction of rich families and the heavy pressure of taxation necessary to repair Nero's havoc produced an effect for which philosophers had striven in vain. Moreover, the Emperor set the fashion, whether in thought or in fashions of beards; and Vespasian was fundamentally a bourgeois Italian characterized by Italian common sense and wit.

It is, I think, wrong to suggest, as Henderson does, that Vespasian forced the pace in ruler-worship, and to say as he says (p. 29), "It was already in Vespasian's day that the Flavian family was set up upon a pedestal for all men's reverence and worship. The Imperial House became a 'domus divina,' the family home on the Quirinal a 'templum,' the Princeps 'sacratissimus.' Even the women of the house and the babies who died in infancy received divine honours after death. . . . And the Flavian gens acquired a special priesthood, the 'Sodales Flaviales,' to conduct the worship of its deified members." Divina domus occurs once in Statius§; the inscription containing the phrase which Henderson refers to this period cannot be precisely dated, and is probably as early as the time of Claudius. It is a dedication "for the safety of the divine house" found at Chichester and made by King Cogidubnus, a Roman vassal. || This is the language of a subject, and therefore no clear indication of Imperial policy; in any case, it must be remarked that a dedication exists at Naix in Belgium "in honour of Tiberius Cæsar and on behalf of the perpetual safety of the divine house,"¶ that superbiens honore divince domus occurs in Phædrus, who wrote under Claudius; and that since the concept of the domus Augusta, the

^{*} Dessau, Inscriptiones latinæ selectæ, 252.

[†] Tac., Ann., iii., 55. We may note the constant polemic of the elder Pliny against extravagance (as for instance N. H., ix., 104 f., 114; xii., 2; xxii., 3), though we must not attach too much importance to it, since such polemic is almost a literary convention.

The note, p. 29, 3, gives two false references.

[|] C. I. L., vii., 11; a reproduction in Furneaux-Anderson's edition of Tacitus's Agricola, p. 79. The Cogidubnus of this text is almost certainly identical with the Cogidumnus of whom Tacitus says (Agric. 14) is ad nostram usque memoriam fidissimus permaneit. From this it has been inferred that C. was living when Tacitus wrote in 98. But the phrase naturally refers not to the time at which Tacitus was writing, but to a time which he can remember (cf. Cicero, De imperio Cn. Pompeii, 54, where usque ad nostram memoriam refers to conditions considerably earlier than the time of speaking). The inscription is on lettering dated by Anderson (op. cit., 80) as "hardly later than the early Flavian age"; the likeliest date for it is under Claudius, when the Imperial cult was established in Britain and the temple of Claudius built at Colchester (so Miss Toynbee kindly suggests to me; G. Calza in De Ruggiero, Diz. Epigraf., ii., 2063, agrees).

[¶] Corp. inscr. lat., xiii., 4635: Tib. Cæsar[i Aug.] fil. Augusto et pro perpetua.

Emperor's household, as an entity existed from the time of Augustus, it was a trivial matter for a subject to add divina, an epithet commonly coupled in homage with anything to do with the Emperor.*

Sacratissimus I find of Domitian alone among the Flavians, and that in a petition; anyhow, it does not mean much more than the regular sacrosanctus. Further, for the honours paid to Imperial women and children there was not merely the precedent of Nero, which. Henderson quotes, but also that of Claudius, who secured divine recognition for Livia and Livilla, and the sodales Flaviales are quite in the tradition of the sodales Augustales and sodales Augustales Claudiales. T Vespasian did indeed introduce the Imperial cultus in Africa and at Corduba in the part of Spain called Bætica, but that was as an instrument of Romanization and a means of securing the loyalty of influential provincials by flattering their feelings of self-importance: to be provincial high priest of the cult of the Emperor and Rome meant something like being Lord Lieutenant of a county. Under Vespasian we have neither the Byzantinism of Diocletian nor that spontaneous outburst of popular emotion which acclaimed Augustus as more than man. Vespasian's private feelings may well be indicated by his remark on his deathbed, Væ, puto, deus fio; we may note the cool tone of Pliny's reference to the deification of Augustus himself.§ Domitian was of a different type; his position of subordination first to Vespasian and Titus, then to Titus, seem to have produced in him what we should now call an "inferiority complex," and he was impatient of half-

^{*} Phædrus, v., 7, 38; divinæ manus is used of Claudius by Scribonius Largus p. 5.30, Helmreich (cf. M. P. Charlesworth, Cl. Rev., 1925, 113 ff.); for this use of divinus cf. Thes. ling. Lat., v., '1633, 34 ff. For the "house of Augustus" cf. the letter of Claudius to Alexandria in 41 (P. Lond., 1912, l. 32; in Bell, Jews and Christians, 23): ἐγὰ ὀρᾶ γὰρ ⟨ὅτι⟩ πάντη μνημεῖα τῆς ἡμετέρας (leg. ὑμετέρας εὐσεβείας) εἰς τὸν ὑμὸν οἰκον ὑδρόσασθαι (leg. ιδρύσασθαι) ἐσπονδάσαται (for ατε). A curious point, to which I hope to return elsewhere, is the rarity of θεῖος οἰκος in the Greek half of the Empire. On a hasty examination I find οἶκφ θείφ only in the two dedications in or near Serdica in Thrace (Inser. gr. ad res Rom. i., 682; Suppl. epigr. gr., i., 303), and in another at Trajans Ulpia in Mæsia only as restored conjecturally (Inser. gr. ad res Rom., i., 1492); in Egypt θεῖος οἰκος not till the 6th and 7th centuries A.D. (Preisigke, Worterbuch, ii., 163), θειστάτη οἰκία not till P. Oxy., 1134 (421 A.D.) We do find αἰώνος οἰκος and ἀφθαρτοςχκαὶ ἀθάνατος οἰκος as early as Tiberius (Inser., iv., 144, at Cyzius; iii., 547, at Tlos).

[†] Dessau, Inscr. lat. sel., 6105 (82 A.D.).

Marquardt, Romische Staatsverwaltung, iii., 471 ff.

[§] N. H., vii., 150, in summa deus ille cælumque nescio adeptus magis an meritus herede hostis sui filio cessit; xxi., 9, apud nos exemplum licentiæ huius non est aliud quam filia divi Augusti, cuius luxuria noctibus coronatum Marsuam litteræ illius dei gemunt. It would appear that Vespasian reduced the number of annual celebrations of the anniversaries of his various honours by the Arval Brothers (W. Henzen, Acta Fratrum Arvalium, 69). Mommsen has urged with force that the Flavian moderation in ruler-cult is the reason why later historians underestimated its range under Augustus (Gesammelte Schriften, iv., 269).

measures.* He went too far, even for the Senate of his day, and his memory was officially condemned and sedulously blackened. He is in literature the bloody tyrant before whom Apollonius of Tyana can be made to show his heroism in a way which Porphyry compares advantageously with Christ's conduct before Pilate.† The reaction was considerable, and Trajan in his coinage canonizes Republican history and proclaims "the unity of the principate with the old Republican libertas" by restoring cointypes not merely of ancient worthies but also of the foes of Julius, Pompey, Brutus, and Eppius.‡

III

Sarapis had helped Vespasian; he expected his reward. We can date from Vespasian's accession a definite rise in influence of the missionary Egyptian cults. On his way to Rome in October, 70, Vespasian spent a night in the temple of Isis in the Campus Martius; this temple appears, as Dressel recognized, on coins of his struck in 71 and 73. Zeus Sarapis, standing or enthroned, begins under Vespasian to appear on the coins of Alexandria, and some of the coins have the legend ΖΕΤΣ ΣΑΡΑΠΙΣ.§ Domitian rebuilt the temples of Isis and Sarapis in the Campus Martius, | and ordered two obelisks to be sent from Egypt to a temple of Isis built at Beneventum in this eighth year of rule; I under him we find coins of Alexandria with the legend ΗΛΙΟΣ ΣΑΡΑΠΙΣ, "Sarapis who is also the Sun."** Domitian was a man of religious feeling; every year he commended himself to Fortuna of Præneste, and when he heard that a tomb was being built out of stones meant for the temple of Juppiter Capitolinus he sent soldiers to destroy it. It may be inferred that he would not be likely to regard as merely

^{*} A small but significant point is that from his twelfth year of rule (92/3) onwards he appears sometimes on the reverse of the Greek coins of Alexandria (which are official issues) as well as having his bust in the normal way on the obverse (J. Vogt, Die Alexandrinischen Münzen, i., 53 ff.).

[†] Kara rwv xpioriavwv fr. 63, p. 84, Harnack (in Abh. preuss. Ak., 1916).

[‡] H. Mattingly, Num. Chron., 1926, 232 ff.

§ Mattingly-Sydenham, op. cit., ii., 70, No. 453, 78, No. 537 (cf. W. Weber, Ein Hermes-Tempel des Kaiser Marcus, Sitzungsber. Heidelb. Ak. Wiss., 1910, vii., 10 ff.; and the Berlin specimen figured in AΓΓΕΛΟΣ, i., 130, pl. v., 1); J. Vogt, op. cit., i., 43 f. The simple legend ΣΑΡΑΠΙΣ appears in Vespasian's third year, 70/1 (B. M. C. Alexandria, 29, No. 239; it occurs again under Titus in 79/80 and 80/1, Vogt, ii.,17); ZΕΥΣ ΣΑΡΑΠΙΣ not till 75/6; both are new features on the coinage. (Note also an altar dedicated on the Capitol to Isis by a slave or freedman of Titus, Corp. inscr. lat., vi., 346, if we accept Mommsen's view of Vespasiani Cæsaris without Imp., of Vespasian, if we follow Dressel.)

Jordan-Hülsen, Topographie der Stadt Rom., I., iii., 567 ff.

Notizie degli scavi, 1893, 267 ff.; 1904, 118 ff. Cf. A. Erman, Rom. Mittheil.,

viii., 210 ff.

** W. Weber, Drei Untersuchungen zur ägyptisch-griechischen Religion (Heidelberg, 1911), 13; Vogt, op. cit., i., 75, 77. These inscriptions do not appear later on Alexandrian coins; in a sense they were perhaps unnecessary.

accidental his escape in December, 69, in the sack of the Capitol, when he saved his life by donning the dress of a priest of Isis. We have here a sufficient explanation of such favour as he showed to the Egyptian deities.* In spite of the younger Pliny's sarcastic suggestion that priests of exotic cults frequented Domitian's court,† there is no reason to suppose that he sought to foster their worship in the way in which Aurelian later promoted that of Sol Invictus. The face of his policy remains Roman: before his elevation to the principate he dedicated a chapel to Iuppites conservator, after it a large temple to Iuppiter custos, and he founded Capitoline games in the god's honour. The devotion most apparent from his coinage is that addressed to Minerva, whom he no doubt regarded as his patroness both in letters and in war.1

The advance of the Oriental deities was due to their own momentum. An obscure incident under Trajan, recently brought to light by J. Vogt, illustrates the way things happened.§ An inscription at Wadi Fatîre in Upper Egypt, dated 108/9, speaks of the υδρευμα εὐτυχέστατον Τραιανὸν Δακικόν and fons felicissimus Traianus Dacicus; a well had been found, and a well-station created. A coin of Alexandria of the year 111/2 shows Sarapis sitting by a water basin, which is being filled from a lion's head (the regular mouthpiece for a spring); behind is a uexillum or company standard. The type is repeated with variations under later Emperors; its original employment probably shows that the finding of the water was regarded as due to the favour of Sarapis. Now we have recently acquired a papyrus record dated in the second century A.D. of how a pilot received water from Sarapis and sold it to the people of Pharos. "And this miracle is entered in the libraries of Mercurium."

^{*} Further, in his eighth year of rule the conspiracy of L. Antonius Saturninus was suppressed (Hirschfeld ap. Erman, p. 215). Why Domitian should take this trouble for the temple at Beneventum we do not know; it may be remarked that it was at Beneventum that he met his father returning from the East, but this can hardly be stressed, since D. does not appear to have been a particularly devoted son.

[†] Paneg., 49, 8 (addressed to Trajan in 100 A.D. and contrasting his regime with Domitian's), neque enim aut peregrinæ superstitionis ministeria aut obscæna petulantia mensis principis oberrat.

[‡] Mattingly-Sydenham, ii., 151; for Athena at Alexandria of. J. Vogt, i., 47. In general, for the Roman character of Imperial religious policy, cf. G. Costa, Religione e Politica nell'Impero Romano (1923), and in particular for Domitian cf. Gsell, 75 ff.; G. Corradi in De Ruggiero, Diz. Epigraf., ii., 2015 ff.

[§] i., 85 ff. || P. Oxy., 1382 (xi., p. 234 ff. in Grenfell and Hunt's publication). The beginning of the text is missing, but it seems to have been something like this.

^{##} ἐνχταῖς Μερκουρίου βιβλιοθήκαις, so rendered by Grenfell and Hunt. They rightly reject the possibility that Μερκουρίου means Ερμοῦ. On the story type cf. Ε. Peterson, ΕΙΣ ΘΕΟΣ, 216 f. He now adds rightly (Theol. Lit. Zeit., 1927, 494) that the word καταχωρίζεται is the regular technical term for putting a document in an official collection of archives.

Let all present say 'There is one Zeus Sarapis.'" Then follows the title "The miracle of Zeus Helios the great Sarapis for Syrion the pilot." The truth is very likely, as Weinreich suggests, that the pilot had found a spring of sweet water welling up near the mouth of the Nile, had regarded it as miraculous, and sold what was left as a relic when he came to land.* The rhetorician Aristides of Smyrna, writing about the middle of the century, says in his prose-hymn To Sarapis, "He it is who is really steward of the winds much more than the islander in Homer (Æolus); he has power to still and rouse which he will. He it is who has sent up drinkable water in midsea, who has raised the fallen, who has caused the dear light of the sun to shine on humanity, whose achievements fill countless numbers of sacred volumes on the sacred shelves."† Aristides visited at Alexandria, probably in 142‡; by then

this is a typical achievement of Sarapis.

The collections of reports of miracles (like those at Epidaurus in Greece proper), aretalogies as they are commonly called, are earlier. They are part of a studied propaganda. Sarapis owed the inception of his Hellenistic cult to deliberate policy, its development was promoted by an organized priesthood at Alexandria, at Rome, and doubtless elsewhere. This priesthood knew the value of propaganda, and (no doubt in all sincerity) was skilful in so using circumstances as to make the accidental appear providential. The discovery of a well in the desert, the bubbling up of sweet water in the sea, these were special mercies of Sarapis. It was easy for these ideas to find expression in coinage; the Egyptian religion of the time was very much an established church, under the supervision of the government, and this must have meant that its heads were in close contact with the ruling Roman officials. Later, at least, if not already, the Egyptian cults outside Egypt made a careful parade of loyalty; the ceremonial launching of the sacred ship (Navigium Isidis) on March 5 was preceded by prayers read by a scribe from a lofty platform "for the mighty Emperor and for the senate and knights, and for the whole Roman people."¶

* O. Weinreich, Neue Urkunden zur Sarapis Religion, 14 ff.

I Boulanger, 490. Wissowa, Religion und Kultus der Römer, ed. ii., 357 f.

|| See H. Stuart Jones, Fresh Light on Roman Bureaucracy. We may remark that Vogt has observed (i., 72 f.) the appearance at Alexandria from 106 onwards of a great variety of local religious types.

¶ Apul., Met., xi., 17, describing the ceremonies as they took place at Cenchreæ, the port of Corinth.

[†] I., p. 95, Dindorf=ii., p. 360, Keil (quoted by Weinreich). This speech is dated circa 142 by A. Boulanger, Elius Aristide, 161 (cf. 122 f., 489 f.); it was probably delivered in Smyrns (Wilamowitz, Sitzungsber. preuss. Ak., 1925, 339). On the religious ideas of Aristides himself cf. Boulanger's admirable account, p. 163 ff.; they are in many respects parallel to those expressed in the theological oracles discussed by me in a forthcoming paper in Revue des Etudes anciennes, 1928.

This was in keeping with a habit of the time of making various religious acts with special intention for the Emperor's well-being*; it had special force, since Isis was regarded as herself a queen and the protectress of monarchs,† and the Emperor was regarded as a Pharaoh.†

The penetration of the West by these and other Oriental beliefs went on apace. The elder Pliny, in a passage on the growth of the custom of wearing rings, remarks, "And now men too begin to carry also Harpocrates and representations of Egyptian deities on their fingers "\signets; such rings were no doubt merely curios to the eyes of some of their wearers, but they probably had the value of amulets to most. The tendency to

believe was itself markedly on the increase.

How the Eastern religions satisfied this has been brilliantly set forth by Cumont in Les religions orientales dans le paganisme romain. They came with an authority and a self-confidence which made the native worship seem easy-going. Isis is "great mistress of Beneventum" in the hieroglyphic inscriptions on the obelisks which we have mentioned; it is tempting to think of the Italian straying in attracted by the novelty of the temple and its shorn priests and daily service, and demanding the meaning of these incomprehensible scratchings on stone. An interesting figure of the period is Statius, a court poet of Domitian's, a Greek from Naples. He speaks reverently of Cybele and of Isis; he introduces at the end of the first book of the Thebaid an invocation in ritual form of Apollo who is also the Sun, Osiris, and Mithras.

IV.

In this period there grew apace Christianity, exercising as it did the attraction exercised by the other Oriental religions and exercising it more effectively. Tof the Domitianic persecution, in which Christians suffered probably in consequence of the official discouragement of Jewish proselytism, Dr.

^{*} Cf. Journ. Hell. Stud., 1925, 92; Calza, Diz. Ep., ii., 2062 ff.; this was so markedly in the cultus of Cybele (cf. J. Carcopino, Rendiconti della Pontificia Accademia Romana di Archæologia, iv., 1926, 231 ff.; H. Lehner, Bonner Jahrbücher, exxix., 46).

[†] G. Roeder, Pauly-Wissowa, ix., 2118. ‡ As in the texts at Beneventum, mentioned p. 156, note ¶ above.

[§] Nat. Hist., xxxiii., 41. A point which may be added is that Apion, a scholar who flourished at Alexandria in the first half of the first century of our era, produced an Αἰγυπτιακά giving allegorical explanations of Egyptian ritual prescriptions and taboos, work which becomes standard for posterity if we accept the argument of M. Wellmann (Hermes, xxxi., 234 ff.).

A. Erman, Röm. Mitth., viii., 210 ff., has drawn attention to the interesting fact that the Egyptian text is drawn up by some one who thought in Greek.

[¶] Cf. my Early Gentile Christianity, 153 ff.

Anian (1980a)

Henderson gives a good account.* It is an obscure story: with Pliny's famous exchange of letters with Trajan we are on altogether different ground. Familiar as the texts are, one or two points deserve to be emphasized.

Pliny speaks of temples in Bithynia as almost deserted. The new religion spread very fast. At the same time, we learn from Pliny of converts who said they had abandoned Christianity before there was any enquiry, some many years before. Some caution is perhaps required about the "many years," in words spoken by a Greek to the all-powerful governor, but the fact seems thoroughly credible. Perhaps, as Dr. Henderson suggests, the explanation is "indifference begotten of familiarity or boredom." It may rather be weariness of the severe discipline imposed upon each member of the community. Must be really stay away from all the festal occasions of the year just because they were associated with pagan deities? Must he be out of all the clubs, because they had their common sacrifices? He had been converted in a flood of emotion; everything had seemed new and splendid: but that had all faded. Or, again, he might have sinned and been excluded from communion by a conservative church which would have none of penance and reconciliations. Christianity in Asia Minor passed this danger; the number of victims in the great persecutions and the absence of pagan reprisals under Julian are eloquent of its success.

Pliny's letter is invaluable for Christian history.† Equally important for our understanding of the spirit of the age is Trajan's reply: "Anonymous denunciations are not to be entertained in any accusation of any kind. For this would be a most pernicious precedent, and moreover it is not agreeable with the temper of our age." Nec nostri sœculi est.‡ It was to be a new clean age of noble aspirations. There have been worse aspirations than those of Trajan and of his successors.

A. D. Nock.

aparata da la calcana de l

^{*} Pp. 42-53. Add S. J. Case, Journ. Bibl. Lit., xliv. (1925), 10 ff., on indications in Josephus of a fear of increasing hostility to Judaism under Domitian; F. H. Colson, Cl. Rev., 1925, 166 ff. For the passage from Hegesippus quoted by Eusebius, Prop. evang., iii., 20 (translated, p. 50 f.), we may note that the motif of an Emperor's religious curiosity is known to us also from Plutarch's tale of the death of Great Pan (Cl. Rev., 1923, 164 f.). It is significant that we find Fisci Ivdaici Calumnia Sublata among Nerva's coin-legends; it refers to the abolition of informations laid in connection with the tax levied on Jews (W. Weber, Hermes, 1915, 62 ff.).

[†] To the literature cited add Reitzenstein, Die Hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen, ed. iii., 192 ff., and my note, Cl. Rev., 1924, 58 f.

[‡] Cf. W. Weber, Festgabe K. Müller, 39 ff.; G. Boissier, La Religion Romaine, ii., 151 ff.; Rostovtzeff, Social and Economic History, 118.

MISCELLANEA

NOTES AND COMMENTS

We have received copies of two beautiful penny pamphlets, published by the S.P.C.K., entitled respectively Prayer at the Eucharist and Helps to Self-Examination, which form Nos. 14 and 15 in the series of "The Churchman's Penny Books." The former is advice to those who attend a daily Eucharist; the latter sets the Christian way of life before the conscience in eight simple forms, mostly taken from the New Testament. The paraphrase of 1 Cor. xiii. strikes us as particularly happy and helpful. This series of penny books should be available in every church. They are at once restrained and on fire with devotion.

A reader of Theology wrote to us some time ago with regard to the Imitation and the possibility of spiritual dangers in its use, based on personal experience. We asked our correspondent in reply what books of devotion had helped her most, and the answer is: "Three. From the age of eight, The Pilgrim's Progress; from about eighteen, George Herbert's Poems; from about twenty-one, St. Augustine's Confessions." It would be exceedingly interesting if others of our readers would send us similar lists, so that we compare them and see which are the favourites.

The Rev. W. B. Trevelyan's Readings from John Cassian, entitled A Master of the Desert (Faith Press, 3s.), will be found suggestive and helpful for Lent reading, and a useful adjunct to Dr. Lowther Clarke's The Ascetic Works of St. Basil, to which we drew attention in this connexion last year. A preface is contributed by Mr. Athelstan Riley, and the Editor expresses his thanks to Mr. W. R. V. Brade for help in the work of translation. As Mr. Trevelyan says, Cassian is one of the seed-plots of the later devotional literature of the Church. We might also add that these passages of Cassian often recall the writings of thinkers and moralists of much earlier date, such as Aristotle and Theophrastus.

Elisabeth June: Her Mother's Diary (S.P.C.K., 1s.) is the story of a beautiful little life, that of the daughter of the Rev. A. R. and Mrs. Browne-Wilkinson. She died just after her seventh birthday, but her life was as rich in prayer and heavenly thoughts as many that have seen seventy birthdays. To many a mother wondering how she shall help her children to love our Lord, this book will come as a joyful and very human guide and there is none who will not understand it.

STUDIES IN TEXTS

(a) St. Mark x. 13-16.

"It fell upon a summer's day,
When Jesus walked in Galilee,
The mothers from a village brought
Their children to His knee."

So sings Stopford Brooke in a beautiful poem, which, like the familiar pictures, is based on St. Luke, with his mention of βρέφη, babes. But how did the first readers of St. Mark understand the story? Here, as so often,

to read a passage of St. Mark with preconceptions, so far as possible,

put away yields interesting results.*

They were bringing to Him—προσέφερον is impersonal, as St. Matthew's interpretation, προσηνέχθησαν, shows. boys—this fairly represents παιδία. In ch. v. παιδίον is used of a twelve-year old girl; in vii. 28 of children generally; in vii. 30 of a girl (age not specified); in ix. 24 of a boy who had been possessed since childhood, ἐκ παιδιόθεν; in ix. 36 of a child (neither age nor sex specified). that He should touch them—"touch," ἄπτομαι, in every instance in Mark has reference to Christ's healing touch. As the sequel shows, and as Matthew interprets, spiritual blessing is meant. We are reminded of the blessing given by Rabbis to their disciples, and of Old Testament blessings. The Hebrew "blessing" was regarded as a means of grace, not a mere outward sign (see Confirmation, or the Laying on of Hands, i. 7). But the disciples were rebuking them. airois may refer either to the unexpressed subject of προσέφερον (fathers presumably—it is a safe rule not to introduce women into a Bible scene unless they are specified), or to the boys themselves. The latter interpretation is more probable. While maiolov may cover any age from infancy (Matt. ii. 8) to early manhood (John xxi. 5), it most naturally refers to the middle period, since other words are available for the two extremes. In Mark v. and Luke ii. 27 it is used of a twelve-year old child, and this age best fits our passage. The boys had reached the age when the innocence of childhood had not passed and the deeper desires of manhood were forming. Though brought by their parents, as was the child Jesus to the Temple, they pressed forward eagerly to receive the blessing they were old enough to appreciate. That is to say, the practical application of the passage for us is to Confirmation rather than Baptism. Why did the disciples "rebuke" the boys? Some writers suppose they did not want the Master troubled, but that would hardly explain His anger. It was natural, at the spiritual stage they had reached, that they did not want the Master's "blessing" to be given freely to every one that asked, without preliminary sifting and teaching.

But Jesus seeing it grew angry, and said to them, Let the boys come to Me, forbid them not. The last words, $\mu \dot{\eta} \kappa \omega \lambda \dot{\nu} \epsilon r \epsilon$, show that the above interpretation was correct. They recur in Luke ix. 50, where Christ says that a man who follows not with the disciples is not to be regarded as outside the kingdom; the incident follows immediately upon that of the child set in the midst. For of such is the kingdom of heaven—"such" means "of them and those like them." Matt. v. 3 is a close parallel, "blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven." The kingdom belongs to those who are spiritually poor and with utter humility

receive it as a gift from God.

All this is obvious enough and hardly worth saying. But for the next verse I want to suggest an interpretation which does not seem to be given in the commentaries. Verily I say unto you, Whosoever does not receive the kingdom of God is maision shall not enter therein. It is assumed that the sentence in full is "as a boy receives it"; so the Vulgate, "velut parvulus." The meaning then is: A boy is conscious of his poverty, he owes all to his elders, and receives nothing by merit. So must you receive the kingdom, if you are to enter it at all.

This is good sense and can fairly be extracted from the Greek, though,

^{*} I venture to repeat some sentences from an article contributed to The Expositor n October, 1924.

like many apparently simple passages of the Gospels, it is unexpectedly difficult when pondered. "Receiving" and "entering" are completely different metaphors; why should you need to enter into what you have already received? I suggest, therefore, that To maiolov is not a nominative at all, but an accusative. "As a boy" means "in the form of a boy." This is far more pointed. Our Lord has just said that the kingdom belongs to these and such-like boys. Here then it is, appearing undetected before their eyes. Interpreting St. Mark by himself, we turn back to ix. 36, 37 and our view is confirmed. Our Lord takes a boy, puts him in the midst of them, and says: "Whosoever receives one of such boys in My name, receives Me." "In My name" means "as representing Me." Now in Luke xvii. 21 we read: "The kingdom of God is in your midst," that is, in the person of Me, its representative.* Taking the two passages together and comparing them with Mark x. 14, we see the point of our passage. Ségnai is an unnatural word to use of things, but thoroughly in place as applied to persons. "Whosoever refuses to receive the kingdom when it comes to them in the form of eager boys pressing forward for a blessing," as you have refused, shall not enter therein. The harshness of the two expressions disappears. "Enter" refers to the kingdom to come, in its eschatological sense: "receive" to the persons in whom (in a measure, as in Jesus fully) it already was manifested by anticipation. And putting His arm around them (åykáln is the bend of the arm) He was

May I suggest that the passage, interpreted as above, might be profitably used for meditation by a priest before taking a Confirmation class? In the fullness of his theological knowledge and spiritual experience he may easily forget how precious a thing immature faith is. Maxima debetur pueris reverentia. Yes, and the Gospel story shows us the precept

worked out in life by God Incarnate.

W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE.

(b) St. Luke xii. 27, 28.

Few passages in literature rival the twelfth chapter of St. Luke in the sustained eloquence of its language; and no verse in this chapter is more eloquent than that which speaks of "the lilies of the field" and their clothing. Yet I venture to question whether the point of the passage has been quite rightly grasped. The usual interpretation is that the passage (Luke xii. 16-31) is a warning against undue anxiety. The death of the rich man who has just resolved to enlarge his property is a proof of its futility; and the care-free sufficiency enjoyed in different ways by the ravens and the flowers is supposed to show that it is unnecessary. God will provide food and raiment.

Various considerations, however, seem to me to suggest that this is

not the primary meaning:

(a) The whole context is eschatological (from verse 16 to verse 48, at least), and indeed one of the most strongly eschatological passages in any of the Gospels. The Evangelist may, of course, have massed together here sayings which were spoken on different occasions; but those parts of it which come from Q—i.e., more than half the whole—were probably found in that order by St. Luke. In any case, if we can get at what the passage in its complete form meant for the Evangelist himself, we shall have done much.

^{*} The other rendering is hardly possible. Could Jesus have said to the Pharisees: "The kingdom of God is in your hearts"?

(b) The common interpretation is open to some linguistic criticisms. Throughout the passage, for instance, the emphasis seems to lie as much on the object of the anxiety as on the fact of it. What our Lord forbids is anxiety about food, drink, clothing—the outward needs of everyday life, in fact, which distract men's attention from the true ends and solid blessings of life eternal. Thus, after describing God's provision for the ravens, our Lord goes on to say, not simply that God will provide like food for men, but, "How much you differ from the birds!"—i.e., He will provide some much higher kind of food for you. Again, in the case of the lilies, the argument is not simply that God clothes them, and therefore He will a fortiori clothe you; but rather, "God clothes the lilies, flowers of a day as they are, in regal glory: therefore He will clothe you with a glory more than regal—with what St. Paul calls 'an exceeding weight of glory.'" But when? Surely, when the kingdom comes, with its resurrection to eternal life.

(c) If, moreover, the passage refers to what God is going to do in the kingdom, we may note some interesting connexions of thought. The ravens' food and drink points to the Messianic banquet which the sons of the kingdom will enjoy. The glorious clothing, again, of which the lilies' beauty is the earthly analogue, has affinities both backwards, in Jewish thought, and forwards, in Christian thought. For the "garments of glory" in the Jewish apocalypses references will be found in Plummer's Commentary on 2 Cor. v. 2 (I.C.C.). In the New Testament we have the repeated allusions to the white robes of the saints in Revelation (iii. 5, 18, iv. 4, vi. 11, vii. 9, 13); and the verb used by the seer for "clothing" ($\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \beta \acute{a} \lambda \lambda \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ and compounds) is the same as that used by our Lord of Solomon in Luke xii. 27. St. Paul's elaboration of the metaphor in 2 Cor. v. is likewise in the same tradition; and our Lord's words, placed by St. Matthew in connexion with the Q passage on anxiety, "Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof," finds an echo in what St. Paul says of the "groaning" with which we long for the "clothing" from heaven.

(d) Our Lord's words in Luke xii. 32, "Fear not, little flock, it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom," are thus an apt summary of the meaning of the passage. The Christian is to cease from anxiety, not because he is now in a world which calls for none, but because, if he seeks the kingdom, he will be. This does, in fact, correspond to the facts of life, for we often see God's people suffering from need and poverty; and, even though in a Christian country provision is made for the destitute, we cannot say that their food is as ample as the ravens' or their clothing comparable to Solomon's. On the other hand, anxiety will do no good; while the anchoring of imagination and hope upon the "other world," where God's grace is unimpeded and His glorious purposes for men achieved, is of secure benefit to the whole personality, both soul and body.

E. G. SELWYN.

NOTE

same amonth Landon of the or of

THE SEVEN ROOT SINS

THE Seven Root Sins is a useful subject for a course of instruction in Lent. The list is a very old one and is found in the writings of John Cassian, St. Gregory the Great, St. Isidore of Seville, St. John of Damascus, Alcuin, Peter Lombard, and St. Thomas Aquinas. Bishop Andrewes gives it in

his Preces Privatæ for Wednesday.* These vitia or peccata principalia or originalia or capitalia are the root sins, the fountain-heads from which the rest flow. Chaucer calls them the "chieftains of sins." "Every one of them," he says, "hath his branches and his twigs." Alcuin calls

them the originalia omnium vitiorum.

A later name was "mortal or deadly sins" (mortis peccata or peccata mortalia). Chaucer knows them by this name, and Shakespeare speaks of "the deadly seven." The term is popular and not strictly correct. In moral theology the term is generally used of sins that remove a Christian altogether from a state of grace and lead to spiritual death. But mortal sins in the strict sense cannot be enumerated, since the deadly character of sins depends upon the state of the will. "Root Sins" is a better name for the catalogue.

The seven sins are (1) pride (superbia), (2) envy (invidia), (3) anger (ira), (4) sloth or accidy—ἀκηδία† (tædium cordis, anxietas, tristitia), (5) covetousness (avaritia, amor pecuniæ), (6) gluttony (gula—i.e., gulæ

concupiscentia), (7) lust (luxuria, incontinentia).

Eastern writers generally and the early Westerns enumerate eight principal vices: (1) gluttony, (2) fornication, (3) avarice, (4) sadness, (5) wrath, (6) accidy, (7) vainglory, and (8) pride. Western writers generally distinguish between guilty sorrow on one's own account (accidy) and that on account of others' good (envy), and they generalize fornication into lust. They also treat pride and vainglory as identical and put it first on the list. St. Gregory treats pride as the root of all the rest.

The opposite virtues to the seven sins (remedia contra septem vitia capitalia) are (1) humility (humilitas), (2) love (caritas), (3) patience (patientia), (4) diligence (vigilantia), (5) generosity (benignitas, largitas),

(6) temperance (temperantia, moderatio), (7) chastity (castitas).

Dante divides purgatory into seven circles or terraces, and on each terrace one of the seven sins is punished. On the first three terraces are the proud, the envious, and the angry-all those whose desires were distorted. They had sought what is bad-i.e., their neighbour's harm. On the middle terrace are the slothful—those whose desires were defective. They had been lacking in zeal and resolution. On the three highest terraces are the avaricious, the gluttonous, and the lustful—those whose desires were excessive or ill-regulated. In each case the suffering is suited The proud who once carried their heads high, walk with to the sin. difficulty now, bent double by huge loads; the burdens they disdained among the living they bear among the dead. They are punished on the lowest of the seven terraces, which is furthest away from Paradise and the presence of God. On the next terrace are the envious: once they took delight in seeing the ills of others, now they see nothing, for their eyelids are stitched together. On the third terrace are the angry, stifled in a thick and bitter smoke. On the fourth are the avaricious, and they have to lie face downward while they repeat, Adhæsit pavimenti anima mea. (Amongst them is Pope Adrian V. The papacy had given him the highest possessions that the earth affords, but covetousness had quenched his love for good.) On the sixth terrace the gluttonous waste away in sight of food they cannot eat. On the seventh the lustful are scorched in the heat of a terrible fire.

* The writer is much indebted to Dr. Brightman's notes in his edition of the

XVI. 93

[†] Bishop Francis Paget's delightful essay on accidy in his Spirit of Discipline is well known. 12

The list of root sins, universally adopted in western mediæval theology. has been severely criticized in modern times; yet most careful writers admit "It is an attempt," says Kirk (in Some Principles of Modern its value. Theology), "to enumerate in theological rather than psychological language, and from the view of experience rather than that of scientific investigation, those of the primary instincts which are most likely to give rise to sin. And in comparison with the conclusions of present-day psychology, we must confess that it is not at all an unsuccessful attempt." Dr. Strong (in Christian Ethics) considers that the absence of lying from the list is unfortunate. But lying must generally be traced back to pride, or envy, or avarice as its source. It is sometimes asked why such a great sin as murder is not included in the list. The answer is that murder is not a root sin, but it springs from envy, anger, or covetousness, or sometimes from all three. Similarly theft usually proceeds from envy or covetousness. It has been objected that the list, as a whole, represents the moral experience of monastic life; but it may be answered that human nature, whether inside or outside the cloister, is much the same.

Each of the root sins represents the perversion or distortion of a primary natural instinct which in itself is not sinful, and may be right and good if exercised under proper conditions and with a right aim. For instance, there is a wholesome pride, a rightcous anger, and an unselfish envy. The rightness or wrongness of an act must depend on the motive which prompts it, the will which guides it, and the means used in its accomplishment.

J. S. Badcock.

The Rectory,

THE RECTORY,
S. SHENEN, R.S.O.,
CORNWALL.

A REPORT ON FASTING COMMUNION

[We received some time ago, for publication in Theology, a copy of the Report of a Committee appointed by the Federation of Catholic Priests on Fasting and Abstinence. In view of the attention recently drawn to the subject, and of the acknowledged learning of the members of the Committee, we believe that this Report will be of general interest to our readers.—E. G. S.]

REPORT OF THE FEDERATION OF CATHOLIC PRIESTS' COMMITTEE ON FASTING AND ABSTINENCE.

Two questions were submitted to the Committee—namely:

1. The observance of days of fasting and abstinence.

2. The fast before Communion, and the bearing on it of the recent papal relaxations.

On these two questions the Committee begs to report as follows:

I. Days of Fasting and Abstinence.—In the pre-Reformation English
Church the distinction between days of fasting and days of abstinence

Church the distinction between days of fasting and days of abstinence amounted to little, as all Fridays out of Eastertide were kept as days of fasting. This remained the rule for English Roman Catholics till 1781, when Pope Pius VI. reduced the Friday fast to abstinence.

In view of this pre-Reformation English custom it is probable, though not certain, that the phrase in the Prayer Book, "Days of fasting or abstinence," was not intended to imply a distinction between days of

XVL Q3

fasting and days of abstinence. At any rate, since in the sixteenth century both fasting and abstinence were understood to include abstaining from flesh meat, and since there is no indication that this use of language had been altered by the seventeenth century, the list in the Prayer Book appears to require that no flesh meat be eaten on any of the days in the table of "vigils, fasts, and days of abstinence": and probably it is implied that on all of them there is also to be a diminution in the amount of food taken. By the Act of Parliament 25 Hen. 8, cap. 21, the granting of dispensations was placed in the hands of the Archbishop of Canterbury, or, failing him, two spiritual prelates or persons appointed by the Crown. This was repealed by 1 and 2 Phil. and Mary, cap. 8, and re-enacted by 1 Eliz., cap. 1. The Act of Parliament 2 and 3 Edw. 6, cap. 19, placed the giving of dispensations in the hands of the king. The Act 5 Eliz. cap. 5, passed after the re-enactment of the Act placing the authority in the hands of the Archbishop of Canterbury by 1 Eliz., cap. 1, allowed temporary dispensations in cases of illness to be given by the bishop of a diocese or the incumbent of a parish. This legislation of Parliament was acquiesced in by the English Church, and there are instances of the Archbishop of Canterbury giving dispensations in the reign of Elizabeth. In the nineteenth and twentieth centuries some English bishops have given dispensations for their dioceses or to individuals.

So far then as the law of the English Church is concerned, all the days in the table of "vigils, fasts, and days of abstinence" are days of abstinence; all or some of them are days of fasting also; and there has been a provision of an unsatisfactory kind for dispensation from this law.

In the Church of Rome until recently the law has been for days of abstinence to be observed by abstinence from flesh meat, and days of fasting by abstinence from flesh meat, eggs, milk, butter, and cheese, and by a great diminution in the amount of food. This law has been exceedingly rigorous, and in Lent it probably has been completely observed only by some religious orders on the Continent and a few exceptional individuals. Large dispensations from it have been granted by papal indults and the pastoral letters issued by the diocesan bishops at the beginning of Lent. The law has now been greatly altered, as is shown in the new Codex iuris canonici, issued in 1917. According to it days of abstinence are kept simply by abstinence from flesh meat; and days of fasting, except Ash Wednesday, the Fridays and Saturdays (which for some countries may be altered to Wednesdays and Fridays) in Lent, Ember Days, the vigils of Pentecost, the Assumption, All Saints, and Christmas, are no longer days of abstinence also, and on them any kind of food may be eaten at the one full meal, though flesh meat may not be eaten at the two smaller meals which are allowed (Can. 1250-1252).

Probably in the past many English Church people have observed a rule more or less following the dispensations of the papal indults and Roman Catholic diocesan bishops prior to the Canon Law of 1917.

If useful regulations in regard to days of fasting and abstinence could be obtained from the English bishops acting collectively, that would be to be desired. In the absence of such regulations, there is little more to be said than that individuals who wish to keep the law of the Church should seek advice from prudent directors.

II. The Fast before Communion.—This question is of great and pressing importance. Though the difficulty of observing the fast before Communion is often exaggerated, it is great in some cases of priests who are old

or in ill-health, or who serve two Churches at a distance from one another; and the consideration of the difficulty has been brought up acutely by the

recent papal relaxations.

The Holy Communion was instituted at the Last Supper. This Last Supper may have been (1) the actual Passover, or (2) a meal to which our Lord gave a paschal character, or (3) the "Kiddush" or weekly Sanctification of the Sabbath or Sanctification of a great feast following a meal (see Box in Journal of Theological Studies, April, 1902; "B" in Ephemerides Liturgicae, February, 1903; Lambert in Journal of Theological Studies, January, 1903). In any case, it was a sacred meal. If it was the Passover, our Lord and the Apostles would have been fasting all day until the Passover meal according to the Jewish rule. In any case, they had partaken of the meal before the institution of the Eucharist. The best authorities agree that the Eucharist described in 1 Cor. xi. 20-30 was after a common meal or love-feast (Agape), although some of the fathers thought that it was before such a meal. It was the opinion of St. Augustine, who says that the practice was universal at the end of the fourth century, that in consequence of the disorders at Corinth St. Paul ordered fasting reception of the Holy Communion, which hence became the rule of the Universal Church (see St. Augustine, Ep. 54, 7-9). There does not, however, appear to be any evidence that this opinion of St. Augustine's was based on anything more than conjecture, due to the tendency to assume that any occumenical and edifying custom must have had an apostolic origin. The gradual disuse of the Agape through the disorders which may have in many places, as at Corinth, accompanied it, coupled with an instinctive sense of the fitness of things, is sufficient to account for the universal diffusion of the custom of abstaining from food before Communion. It is not known how long before the end of the fourth century the custom had become œcumenical; the earliest known allusion to the observance is at Carthage at the end of the second century (see Tertullian, Ad Uxor., ii. 5).

So far as the scanty evidence supplies a conclusion, the exceptions allowed in the undivided Church to this custom of fasting before Communion, when once it had become eccumenical, were very few, and, apart from Communion in extremis, which probably was always permitted to those not fasting, to have been local and temporary and for some quite special reason. The two known instances of exceptions are in the case of the evening celebration of the Liturgy in North Africa on Maundy Thursday in the fourth and fifth centuries, apparently also in Gaul in the sixth century, and an isolated instance at Alexandria in the fourth or fifth century, when the eating of a few dates was allowed when the vigil of the Epiphany came on a Sunday, and because of the vigil the Mass would be after 3 p.m., while to fast on Sunday would have seemed to favour heresy.* These instances are fully discussed by Father Puller in his Concerning

the Fast before Communion, pp. 32-34.

It is difficult to obtain information as to the present practice in the Eastern Church. Both official documents (e.g., Orthodox Confession, i. 107) and individual writers (e.g., Makarios, Theol. Dogm. Orth., ii. 482) merely mention the fast before Communion without any details or discussion. The ordinary practice seems to be that an individual confessor, by virtue

The instance of the Egyptians mentioned by Socrates, Hist. Eccl., 5, 22, 42, 43, is not to the point, because it was not allowed by the Church, and is said by Socrates to be different from "the custom of Christians."

of his ordinary jurisdiction, can give leave to an individual to receive food before Communion on a particular occasion, but that, if the leave is to become habitual, he must obtain confirmation of it from a higher authority.

It is not known that exceptions from the custom were allowed in the

pre-Reformation English Church.

The practice of fasting before Communion lingered in a few instances in the English Church till the nineteenth century; and it was more widely

restored as a result of the Oxford Movement.

The papal theologians have long claimed that authority to dispense from the fast before Communion belonged to the Pope; and there have long been occasional instances of the exercise of this authority. The lawfulness of certain exceptions to the custom was affirmed by the Council of Constance (A.D. 1414-1418), Session 13: "Although Christ instituted this venerable Sacrament after supper . . . yet, notwithstanding, the praiseworthy authority of the holy canons and the approved custom of the Church has kept and keeps the observance that this Sacrament ought not to be consecrated after supper, nor received by the faithful if they be not fasting, except in the case of sickness or other necessity allowed and admitted by law (iure) or the Church." In most cases the papal dispensations were granted because of some "necessity," as contemplated by the Council of Constance; but in the instances of, at any rate, the Emperor Charles V. and James Stuart the dispensations were given to allow those princes to communicate frequently of devotion. It is understood that such dispensations were very rarely given to priests at any time; and during the greater part of the nineteenth century they were very rarely granted to any. Dispensations to lay people in ill-health had become less unusual than they had formerly been in the early years of the twentieth century; they were allowed to be given by individual confessors by decrees of the Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office of 7th December, 1906, and 6th March, 1907; and in 1917 the lawfulness of non-fasting Communion in certain cases was definitely recognized in the revised Canon Law by the provision that those who have been in bed for a month and have no certain hope of speedy recovery may, with the prudent advice of a confessor, receive the Holy Eucharist once or twice a week, even though they have taken medicine or some liquid food before (see Canon 858, § 2). "Liquid food" has usually been interpreted to include tea, coffee, chocolate, milk containing beaten-up eggs, liquid in which something solid has been mixed, provided the liquid form remains. The canon does not allow non-fasting Communion to others than those who have been in bed for a month; but it is understood that those who are not wholly confined to bed are included under it, and that those who are not mostly in bed or confined to the house can now easily obtain a dispensation from the Pope, if they are in sufficient ill-health (see, e.g., Damen's edition of Ertnys, Theol. Mor., ii. 160). In this revision of the Canon Law nothing was said explicitly about priests; but a hint of future legislation was given in the article on the sacred congregations, where it was mentioned as part of the duty of the Congregation of the Holy Office to deal with "all matters relating to the Eucharistic fast of priests celebrating Mass" (see Can. 247, § 5). In 1923 the Congregation of the Holy Office addressed a letter to ordinaries, in the course of which it was said: "Lest perchance by reason of the ecclesiastical law . . . Christ's mystical body, or the salvation of souls, should suffer any loss, this supreme Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office, taking into consideration the number of duties which priests have to perform on feast days in order to feed their flocks well with saving nourishment, and that on account of the fewness of the clergy many of them are obliged to repeat the celebration of Holy Mass, and that frequently in places far apart and hard to reach, especially in times of bad weather or in other unfavourable circumstances, has decided to mitigate the same law of fasting in some degree in certain cases and on fixed conditions by means of appropriate dispensations. As often, therefore, as priests have in accordance with Canon 806, § 2, to repeat Mass on the same day, or even approach the holy altar at a late hour, if indeed they cannot keep the law of the Eucharistic fast to the full without serious hurt either by reason of weak health or on account of the too heavy work of their sacred ministry or of other reasonable causes, local ordinaries can apply to this supreme congregation carefully explaining all circumstances, and it will deal appropriately with the various cases either by itself dispensing in each one, or, when it can be shown that a real necessity makes it altogether advisable, by granting general facilities to the ordinaries themselves as well. Indeed, these faculties are granted to your Lordship even from now on for urgent cases, when there is not time enough to apply to the Holy See, and they are to be used by yourself as your conscience, upon which a grave responsibility is laid, may direct. On these conditions, however-namely, that only something by way of drink, to the exclusion of any inebriating liquorbe allowed, that scandal be effectually avoided, and that the Holy See be informed as soon as possible of the dispensation granted. Finally, please understand that a relaxation of this most important law is only to be granted when the spiritual welfare of the faithful requires it, and not on account of the private devotion and utility of the priest himself" (see Congreg. S. Offic., 22nd March, 1923).

On the ecclesiastical question whether there can be dispensation from the fast before Communion, different opinions are held among Catholics in the Church of England at the present time.

1. The opinion that there cannot be dispensation from the fast before Communion is based upon the following arguments:

(a) That the fast before Communion is an œcumenical custom approved by the Church.

(b) That approved custom in such a matter has the force of law, and that an occumenical custom cannot be altered or dispensed except by occumenical authority.

(c) That the instances of exceptions from the fast before Communion in the early Church were merely local and temporary, and therefore cannot be regarded as necessarily in accordance with Christian principles, or as affording a precedent which can rightly be followed.

It is therefore concluded:

(a) That the papal dispensations are ultra vires, and could be justified only on the papal theory that the Christians in external communion with the See of Rome constitute the whole Church.

(b) That any dispensations granted either by individual English bishops or with the authority of the English bishops acting collectively would also be ultra vires.

2. The opposite opinion—namely, that it is within the power of an English bishop or of the English bishops acting collectively to grant a dispensation from the strict observance of the rule—is based upon the following arguments:

(a) That, while the obligation to say Mass or to receive Holy Communion rests upon an explicit command of our Lord Himself, the obligation not to take food before Communion rests upon the custom of the Church. To quote the language used in the article, "Fast," in The Catholic Encyclopædia, v. 789, it is "prescribed by the Church."

(b) That, while the Church cannot dispense from obedience to explicit commands of our Lord or to the fundamental precepts of Christian morality, it can dispense in cases of individuals or of specified classes of persons from the observance of rules which it has itself enacted or customs which it has itself sanctioned.

(c) That the welfare of souls in the Church, which is the essential justification of any such dispensations, is committed to the bishops of the Church, as successors of the Apostles, and that, apart from any express limitation of the authority of an individual bishop, which may be laid down in different parts of the Church for its better governance, the immediate and normal responsibility for the souls committed to him lies with the diocesan bishop.

(d) That for those in the Church of England the only form of legislative occumenical authority must mean an occumenical council; that occumenical councils have been held only rarely; that consequently, if the power of dispensation exists at all in the Church, it must be exercised by local administrative authorities, since an administrative power exercised only by a body which may not meet more than once in a thousand years is practically non-existent; that the institution of occumenical councils assumes the existence of executive administrative authorities; that the obligation of the fast before Communion rests on universal custom, not on any canon of an occumenical council; and that therefore the specific authority of an occumenical council is not required in order to allow administrative authorities to dispense.

(e) That the exceptional instances of non-fasting Communion in the undivided Church show that dispensations were given by local ecclesiastical authorities, although the rule of the fast before Communionwasrecognized as œcumenical and normally binding.

(f) That such dispensations are, or may be, granted by the local diocesan bishops of the Eastern Orthodox Church.

(g) That, though the concentration of all authority in the person of the Pope in the Roman Catholic Church, and the claim of ecumenical authority for his jurisdiction, has made papal provision necessary in the Roman Catholic Church before the local episcopate may take action in this matter, yet the fact of the lawfulness of dispensation in respect of the fast before Communion by the administrative authorities of the Church is admitted, and is based on the welfare of souls.

(h) That there is therefore a consensus of opinion both Eastern and Western in support of the principle that dispensations from the fast before Communion can be granted by the administrative authorities of the Church, and in actual practice they are so granted by the local diocesan bishops.

It is further maintained, by those who hold this second opinion, that the adoption by English Catholics of the principle that occumenical custom can be dispensed only by occumenical authority (presumably the authority of an occumenical council) would create for them two insoluble difficulties, one theoretical and the other practical—namely:

- (a) On this principle, dispensations of the kind in question are ultravires. But these dispensations are, or may be, given by all Roman Catholic and all Eastern bishops. Therefore, on this principle, nine-tenths of the Catholic episcopate are acting or are avowedly prepared to act ultra vires, a conclusion which seems to constitute a reductio ad absurdum of the principle.
- (b) The rule which forbids marriage after ordination has the same weight of occumenical authority as, if not a greater weight than, the rule which forbids food before Communion. If the one is indispensable, so is the other. The practical difficulties of a denial by EnglishCatholics of the legitimacy of local dispensations from the first of these two occumenical rules are obvious.

the tiple where our survivers in decide one or concerns the fill

The supplies that the state of the state of

und and the second of the control of the second of the sec

na propostur vide pro ton mendon la provinció de la provinció de la provinció de la provinció de la provinció A filosofísico del programa de la provinció de

water the few and appropries that he had been been an increase on the

has generally and their a free of the selection of the end of the selection of the selectio

to reinfolding the Article Countries of the Ar

tent out and the light out and the lightness of an entropy of the respective of the second of the lightness of the lightness

with a company of well are a company of the

almost) = and by all we have a have built min a

Address to the second of the s

REVIEWS

CONFIRMATION, OR THE LAYING ON OF HANDS. Vol. II. Practical. S.P.C.K. 8s. 6d.

It is an excellent sign of the times that a book of this kind and size should be published. Its size and comprehensiveness are happy indications of the importance which in this day the Church attaches to the practical work of dealing with Confirmation candidates. It is the practical and companion volume to the treatise which appeared two years ago which dealt with the historical and doctrinal aspects of Confirmation, and its treatment of practical questions is not only very complete but very valuable. But the character of the book is even more significant than its size and comprehensiveness. Twelve writers contribute to it, and they represent the various view points possible in the Church of England. The preface modestly states that its purpose is "to provide material which shall enable those who train candidates to learn from Anglican, Evangelical, and Anglo-Catholic alike all that is best and most profitable." It would have been impossible to publish such a book forty years ago, and even if it had been published it would have had few readers. It is significant of the better spirit that obtains amongst us, despite our controversies, that writers of all schools of thought should be able to conspire to help us. It is enough to say that each contributor has stated his own view with clearness and with considerateness of the views of others. It is to be hoped that it will be read and studied as a whole, and in the same spirit in which it is written. It will be found as the book is studied that those who write it are nearer to one another in fundamental things than we are sometimes apt to think.

The book contains a wealth of detail as to the method of preparation, as to the Confirmation service itself, and as to the aftercare of those who have been confirmed. Most of it is common to all schools of thought, and even the most experienced parish priest—indeed, the most experienced bishop—will find much to learn and much that helps. We have gathered together here the experience of many minds adapted to different classes of candidates and to different parochial circumstances. He will be an unwise man, however, who adopts all the suggestions that are here made for his advantage. The preparation of candidates for Confirmation involves a personal relationship, and personal understanding cannot be dealt with in terms

of method or detail alone.

There are some points upon which divergent views are quite considerately set out, and perhaps the most important of these is the age at which children should be confirmed. Dr. Hardman in his introductory chapter decides in favour of from ten to twelve years of age in cases where the conditions are wholly favourable. Canon Grose Hodge, on the other hand, has in his mind candidates of about fifteen years old, and the

headmaster of Rugby agrees with the latter age.

In the earlier pages of the book Dr. Hardman sets out with great fairness the actual situation. He points out that by far the greater number of candidates are from thirteen to eighteen years of age, and that therefore in practice we have come to a general understanding that the adolescent period is the best age. He notes that that period is marked by great and rapid changes, and that we have not yet decided whether its early, middle, or later stages are to be regarded as the most satisfactory for Confirmation. Clearly we must take into account the new bodily powers that mark the period of adolescence; clearly we must consider the right time for instruction on matters of sex, but neither of these considerations is dominant. Confirmation involves dedication to Christ, upon that all our writers seem to be agreed, and in consequence for the candidate there must be understanding and there must be conversion in the sense of surrender to God. There are other and less important considerations that enter: the place of the candidate for confirmation in relation to the Sacrament of Holy Communion, and in relation to the adult life of the Church. It is not the place here to argue the question of the appropriate age; it is only appropriate to say that in our efforts to settle this difficult problem, a problem, perhaps, which cannot be settled at all on general principles, the considerations set out in this book deserve all of them to be carefully weighed.

There is one argument, however, that it seems improper to use. A little while ago the bishop of a diocese had occasion to refuse "to approve" a candidate of very tender years whom it was proposed to present to him. The incumbent of the parish in consequence wrote in his parish magazine, "The Bishop does not appear to think that the work of the Holy Spirit is available for anyone under the age of fourteen." In the haste of the moment he forgot that Christian baptism is with "water and the Holy Ghost," and that all God's working in this age is by His Holy Spirit. A more careful study of the doctrine of grace as a gift, not from outside, but from God, working within us, and a clearer idea of the progressive development of the Christian life would have prevented him from such an error, an error which happily does not obtrude itself in this

book. Really the question of the right time when a lad or a girl should make this solemn act of dedication to God and should ask for and receive the strengthening gifts of His Holy Spirit is not a matter of controversy, but for study and experience

and prayer. This book will help to that end.

A second question which has rightful place in this book is the question of how best to guard young people against the temptations and the evils of the world by careful instruction about self and sex, and the subject is handled with rightful caution. If in the past there was too little of such teaching, there seems danger in the present that there may be too much. Ignorance must be removed, but it can and must be done without hurt to innocence. Moreover, the mind of the child has not yet been explored in its fulness, psychology is a science in its infancy, and it sometimes forgets the danger of the omniscience of youth. It has not yet said its last word, and it will grow wiser as it grows older.

Finally, a word must be said about the vexed question of confession. Some of the writers advocate it as a normal part of the Christian life and system; others would regard it as an occasional remedy for special difficulties; some would by other methods give the help quite happily and successfully that their brethren give through confession. There can be no compulsion and nowhere is compulsion urged in this book. It is loyal to the plain teaching of the Church of England given in the Exhortation of the Communion Office, and although the emphasis in the book varies in different places, the old summary of the

situation stands "All may, none must, some should."

The two volumes, of which this is the second, are a great contribution to practical theology, and its study by the clergy of the parishes will bring real help to the Confirmation candidates in days to come, remembering that they are, in the words of Dean Hook, quoted at the end of the first volume, "those who are just commencing the career of life, and just passing from parental control, going forth into that world which is to the Christian a field of battle wherein under the great Captain of his salvation he is to fight the good fight of faith against the world, the flesh, and the devil." In the name of all such we thank the authors for the help that they have given.

GUY CHELMSFORD.

THE CHURCHES OF EASTERN CHRISTENDOM. By B. J. Kidd, D.D. Faith Press. 15s.

Students have waited long for a book of this kind, and they will welcome Dr. Kidd's work as a valuable aid to the study of

the Eastern Church. It is more than seventy years since J. M. Neale gave us his History of the Eastern Church, but interesting as that work proved to be, it was incomplete as it treated only of the Patriarchates of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, and gave no account of the schism between East and West. The present work covers the whole ground. Dr. Kidd deals with the general history of Eastern Christianity down to the final destruction of the Eastern Roman Empire, 1453.

Eastern Christianity was inextricably interwoven with nationalism and politics, and to show how these two played one upon the other is no easy task; but the writer leads us through the tangle and leaves us with a clear idea of the true position.

Those who think of General Councils as settling religious disputes and bringing immediate peace to the Church, will be disillusioned as they read this work. The Council of Chalcedon, 451, had endeavoured to put at rest the controversy as to the Person of Christ by affirming the two natures in the unity of the one Person, and refusing to allow that either the Divinity or humanity in Christ is impaired by their union. Unhappily, the theological ferment of the East was not appeared by this settlement. Chalcedon, instead of being the end, was but the beginning of a long and bitter controversy, which lasted for seventy years. The opposition was known as Monophysitism; its principles were stated from time to time, in more or less extreme forms, and the crude mistakes of Eutyches were sometimes softened down. But throughout the controversy, its constant belief, that in the Incarnate there is but "one nature," ever appeared. The Emperor Zeno intervened in the interests of peace and supported his action by theological authority, issuing the document called Henoticon in order to conciliate all parties.

This was a skilful compromise, which, while declaring the Creed of Nicæa and Constantinople to be sufficient and setting forth a statement of the Incarnation in an orthodox way, carefully avoided the point at issue. There followed the excommunication of Acacius by Felix of Rome. East and West became estranged for thirty-five years (484-519), and the whole Eastern Church was tainted with Monophysitism. The reign of Justinian is fully dealt with as its importance demands. Justinian was a person of great ability but withal an ambitious man with a great love of power. His ecclesiastical policy is described as "Cæsaropapism" and no Emperor so nearly assumed the position of a temporal Pope. He intervened in theological disputes, controlled General Councils, punished heretics, deprived Patriarchs, and interfered in a score of ways with matters which did not belong to the secular arm. It is

pleasant to turn to another side of his activities: he built the great Church of St. Sophia at Constantinople and San Vitale at Ravenna, and many others; he codified the Roman Law and later legislated for the Church in his Code and then in his Novels. One of these latter (3) limits the number of the clergy for St. Sophia to 425, a number which appears astonishingly large to us in these days. The Monastic Orders play an important part in the religious life of the Empire. There were sixty-eight monasteries of men in the diocese of Constantinople and forty at Chalcedon. An interesting account is given of the celebration of the Liturgy in this reign, and the rule as to the place of the Divine Office in the worship of the Church. "Let all clerics," orders Justinian, "in every church, in their own persons recite Nocturns, Lauds, and Vespers, lest they be taken to be clerics simply for consuming the goods of the Church; bearing the name of clerics, but withdrawing themselves from the service of our Lord God, which is the business of clerics."

It is sad to dwell on the long and miserable story of the growing estrangement between Constantinople and the West. The Monophysite controversy had caused a formal schism between 484 and 519. The Easterns had seen Pope Honorius condemned by a General Council, which had lowered the prestige of the West in their eyes. There were growing differences on both sides, aggravated by misunderstandings and deep-seated prejudices. In the eighth century, Antioch, Alexandria, and Jerusalem were in the hands of the Turk. Rome and Constantinople stood face to face, with political dangers hanging over them. There was no atmosphere of unity within the Church. The Photian Schism was the result of a quarrel between two strong men, each anxious for his rights: neither would give way. Thus East and West drifted apart. There was a patched up peace for a time, but the quarrel broke out again in the eleventh century, and the end came in 1054, when Leo IX. and Michael Cerularius excommunicated each other. The Turkish menace brought reunion to the front again in the fourteenth century, when the Emperor of the East desired help to resist the advancing armies of the Infidel. At Florence, 1439, an agreement was arrived at after long debates, but the popular voice at Constantinople rejected the decisions of that Council. The promised help from Rome did not come, and the breach widened. The West did nothing to save Constantinople from the Turk; he settled in Europe, and we have had an "Eastern Question" ever since. How different things might have been if Christendom had been united at that time? The end of the Eastern Empire soon came. On May 28, 1453, the last Mass was said in St. Sophia. All present knew that the assault was to be delivered at dawn. Constantine, the last ruler, mounted his horse and rode to the defences. He perished, sword in hand, saying, "God forbid that I should live an Emperor without the Empire. I will die with my city."

Dr. Kidd in his later chapters gives an account of the ancient patriarchates and of the Churches of the Balkans and of Russia. The Separated Churches are also dealt with, and there is a chapter on the Uniates. The history of the East Syrian (Nestorian) Church is brought down to 1927. It is pathetic to read of this "Nestorian" remnant. We see them driven from their ancient home and now under British protection in Iraq. They are still waiting for settlement in Iraq as repatriation is impossible. Their young Patriarch, Ishai Mar Shimun, left England last year to join his people, but not to return "home." His home in Qudshanis he will never see again.

This work is indispensable to the student of Eastern Christianity, and the long list of references given at the end of the book is invaluable.

F. N. HEAZELL.

NOTICES

sekundik odok dasa <u>had amazonik adil</u> dili isia bek despusion

entitions address the control of the state o

THE GLORY OF GOD IN THE INCARNATION OF THE WORD. By W. H. G. Holmes, M.A. S.P.C.K. 6s.

There is always a distinctive value in theology written by a missionary, and not unnaturally the supply of this is limited. Often, too, such work suffers from the conditions in which it was written, as was the case with the writings of Frank Weston, who was potentially a great theologian. The book under review is most warmly to be welcomed. Father Holmes has spent nearly twenty-five years in work among intelligent non-Christians, and we do not find the limitations in his work which we might expect. The main purpose of the book is devotional, but it is clear and scholarly, and is certainly the work of a penetrating theologian. Throughout the book Father Holmes's intimate knowledge of heathen religions emerges, and this gives his apology for the Deity of Christ exceptional value.

"A religion is not true because it has some truth in it, but because its great central, distinctive article is true." Islam teaches some truths about God, but it stands or falls with its doctrine of a divinely dictated book. Hinduism has some splendid moral precepts, but it stands or falls with its doctrine of a series of divine appearances in human form, and one of these is "flagrantly and indisputably immoral when tested by the acknowledged standards of human virtue." So Christianity stands or falls with the doctrine of the Word made flesh. Father Holmes convincingly shows that "in reading the New Testament we arrive at this amazing conclusion that men like the Apostles, who were fanatical mono-

theists, were gradually led to the irresistible conviction that the Personality of Jesus Christ was Divine Personality from within the Being of God, and yet they had no difficulty in continuing to proclaim, 'Hear, O Israel, the Lord thy God is one.'" A valuable chapter is that on the witness of Christ's sinlessness. Mohammed made great claims as the mouthpiece of God, but he was under no illusions about his own sin. Jesus is unique

in showing no consciousness of sin.

The second part reminds us somewhat of the writings of Dr. Chandler, though this book is less easy reading than most of those. Father Holmes deals drastically, and in our opinion wholly justifiably, with the Neo-Nestorians in our midst. The Hindu teaches that God is immanent, and so can be worshipped in a tree or a cow. The Liberal Protestant must find it hard to deter him, for he himself worships Jesus as a man in whom God is supremely immanent. "A man indwelt by God and a man who is God represent completely different conceptions. Theologically the difference is unbridgable (sic), and in the life of prayer the difference is a difference of kind; a devotional revolution has taken place." Every page of Part II. deserves careful study. We especially welcome the passage on the sacramental Presence in which the writer replies to those who deny the parallelism between our Lord's presence at Nazareth and His presence in the Holy Sacrament, and emphasizes the immense value of prayer before the tabernacle. The study of meditation as divine suggestion will help many to improve this difficult part of their devotional life. Those who discount all argument from experience are ably dealt with in the last chapter.

"All missionary work is an appeal of authority against authority, of experience against experience." The Christian missionary shows that the Christian experience is different from and superior to the experience

of heathen religions.

Two of the thoughts which the perusal of this important book leaves with us are these: Is it worth while to spend a penny on attempting to convert the heathen to a religion which does not include the doctrine of Christ's Deity in the full Catholic sense? And is it of any value to reunite with Christian bodies which are not committed to this doctrine?

F. Hood.

RESCUE WORK. By E. C. Trenholme, S.S.J.E. S.P.C.K. 2s. 6d.

The author himself calls this a "matter-of-fact little book." The

term describes it in its weakness as well as its strength.

It is in parts laboriously matter-of-fact. It enters occasionally into needless details of household management; nor are there wanting what Mr. Punch would call "glimpses of the obvious," as when we are told that a shelter should be in the quarter it is to serve, or that a house should be of a size and kind to give proper accommodation to the staff and inmates.

Elsewhere, however, it is gloriously matter-of-fact, a plain record of heroic venture and unwearied devotion in what is surely one of the most difficult enterprises of the Church. It is, by the way, only the rescue work of the Church of England that is dealt with, a fact that might perhaps have been indicated in the title.

The old official apathy towards the evil, varied by occasional bursts of ferocity against its victims, seems to have held sway up to the year 1758. Then the spirit of compassion asserted itself and led to the founding of

the assault was to be delivered at dawn. Constantine, the last ruler, mounted his horse and rode to the defences. He perished, sword in hand, saying, "God forbid that I should live an Emperor without the Empire. I will die with my city."

Dr. Kidd in his later chapters gives an account of the ancient patriarchates and of the Churches of the Balkans and of Russia. The Separated Churches are also dealt with, and there is a chapter on the Uniates. The history of the East Syrian (Nestorian) Church is brought down to 1927. It is pathetic to read of this "Nestorian" remnant. We see them driven from their ancient home and now under British protection in Iraq. They are still waiting for settlement in Iraq as repatriation is impossible. Their young Patriarch, Ishai Mar Shimun, left England last year to join his people, but not to return "home." His home in Qudshanis he will never see again.

This work is indispensable to the student of Eastern Christianity, and the long list of references given at the end of the book is invaluable.

F. N. HEAZELL.

paidway out however builded with the month terms of he well house shows

NOTICES

THE GLORY OF GOD IN THE INCARNATION OF THE WORD. By W. H. G. Holmes, M.A. S.P.C.K. 6s.

There is always a distinctive value in theology written by a missionary, and not unnaturally the supply of this is limited. Often, too, such work suffers from the conditions in which it was written, as was the case with the writings of Frank Weston, who was potentially a great theologian. The book under review is most warmly to be welcomed. Father Holmes has spent nearly twenty-five years in work among intelligent non-Christians, and we do not find the limitations in his work which we might expect. The main purpose of the book is devotional, but it is clear and scholarly, and is certainly the work of a penetrating theologian. Throughout the book Father Holmes's intimate knowledge of heathen religions emerges, and this gives his apology for the Deity of Christ exceptional value.

"A religion is not true because it has some truth in it, but because its great central, distinctive article is true." Islam teaches some truths about God, but it stands or falls with its doctrine of a divinely dictated book. Hinduism has some splendid moral precepts, but it stands or falls with its doctrine of a series of divine appearances in human form, and one of these is "flagrantly and indisputably immoral when tested by the acknowledged standards of human virtue." So Christianity stands or falls with the doctrine of the Word made flesh. Father Holmes convincingly shows that "in reading the New Testament we arrive at this amazing conclusion that men like the Apostles, who were fanatical mono-

theists, were gradually led to the irresistible conviction that the Personality of Jesus Christ was Divine Personality from within the Being of God, and yet they had no difficulty in continuing to proclaim, 'Hear, O Israel, the Lord thy God is one.'" A valuable chapter is that on the witness of Christ's sinlessness. Mohammed made great claims as the mouthpiece of God, but he was under no illusions about his own sin. Jesus is unique

in showing no consciousness of sin.

The second part reminds us somewhat of the writings of Dr. Chandler, though this book is less easy reading than most of those. Father Holmes deals drastically, and in our opinion wholly justifiably, with the Neo-Nestorians in our midst. The Hindu teaches that God is immanent, and so can be worshipped in a tree or a cow. The Liberal Protestant must find it hard to deter him, for he himself worships Jesus as a man in whom God is supremely immanent. "A man indwelt by God and a man who is God represent completely different conceptions. Theologically the difference is unbridgable (sic), and in the life of prayer the difference is a difference of kind; a devotional revolution has taken place." Every page of Part II. deserves careful study. We especially welcome the passage on the sacramental Presence in which the writer replies to those who deny the parallelism between our Lord's presence at Nazareth and His presence in the Holy Sacrament, and emphasizes the immense value of prayer before the tabernacle. The study of meditation as divine suggestion will help many to improve this difficult part of their devotional life. Those who discount all argument from experience are ably dealt with in the last chapter.

"All missionary work is an appeal of authority against authority, of experience against experience." The Christian missionary shows that the Christian experience is different from and superior to the experience

of heathen religions.

Two of the thoughts which the perusal of this important book leaves with us are these: Is it worth while to spend a penny on attempting to convert the heathen to a religion which does not include the doctrine of Christ's Deity in the full Catholic sense? And is it of any value to reunite with Christian bodies which are not committed to this doctrine?

F. Hoop.

RESCUE WORK. By E. C. Trenholme, S.S.J.E. S.P.C.K. 2s. 6d.

The author himself calls this a "matter-of-fact little book." The

term describes it in its weakness as well as its strength.

It is in parts laboriously matter-of-fact. It enters occasionally into needless details of household management; nor are there wanting what Mr. Punch would call "glimpses of the obvious," as when we are told that a shelter should be in the quarter it is to serve, or that a house should be of a size and kind to give proper accommodation to the staff and inmates.

Elsewhere, however, it is gloriously matter-of-fact, a plain record of heroic venture and unwearied devotion in what is surely one of the most difficult enterprises of the Church. It is, by the way, only the rescue work of the Church of England that is dealt with, a fact that might perhaps have been indicated in the title.

The old official apathy towards the evil, varied by occasional bursts of ferocity against its victims, seems to have held sway up to the year 1758. Then the spirit of compassion asserted itself and led to the founding of

the Magdalen Hospital in Whitechapel. In the nineteenth century there was a considerable awakening of zeal, conspicuous names being those of Mrs. Tennant and John Armstrong, later Bishop of Grahamstown. In 1852 the Church Penitentiary Association came into being. So the work, in which the Anglican Sisterhoods have taken a leading and honourable part, has developed to a scale that is considerable and a usefulness that

cannot be represented by figures.

The author is careful to explain that his theme is rescue work alone and therefore he does not enter into the many problems that centre round preventive measures. Once, however (on p. 22), he touches on a fact so lightly as almost to represent it in a misleading light, for it is really a far bigger fact than implied by the author's phrase about the difficulty of the "post-war girl." The truth seems to be that in certain levels of society there is a marked reduction both of definite prostitution and in the number of "unwanted babes"; but this result is alleged by many to have come about at the cost of a terrible lowering of the general moral tone through freer sexual intercourse and a more widely spread knowledge of preventive measures. A fuller dealing with this point could hardly have been considered irrelevant to the author's main theme, since it constitutes the most anxious point in the present phase of the whole problem.

The book, however, is valuable as a clear record of a great work; and its strongest point lies in its insistence upon the sheer need of strong religious influence for that recreation of motive without which there can

be no real and permanent saving.

A. H. SIMPSON.

LECTURES IN HYDE PARK. Series II.: If we Believe in God. By C. F. Rogers. S.P.C.K. 2s. 6d.

This set of lectures presupposes that the listener either believes in God, or at any rate is willing to face the natural consequences of such belief. In the light of this faith in God the lecturer treats the questions of Free Will and Pain. Whatever some philosophers may say, we know our wills have a real measure of freedom; this freedom is sometimes confused with licence to do whatever we like, but in reality it is freedom to do what is right. The perfect freedom is that of God, Who is free to do what is His real Nature.

As regards pain, there is much loose thinking on the subject; the first essential is to distinguish the problem of pain from that of sin. We know pain is often caused by sin, and there might thus be far less pain and misery in the world were it sinless; but the problems of their nature

and character must not be confused.

Belief in God must mean belief in One God; this means that there is but one law for all men, that there is only one standard of Right, the standard of God's will. Finally, a sincere belief in God will work in us what we admire in others, the quality which Our Lord Jesus called "purity of heart"—that is, consistency and singleness of life.

The book is fresh and interesting; there is much illustration and many

apposite quotations—which we found very helpful.

E. C. PRICHARD.

MACMILLA

A MEMOIR OF HERBERT EDWARD RYLE, K.C.V.O., D.D.

Sometime Bishop of Winchester, and Dean of Westminster. By the Rev. MAURICE H. FITZGERALD. With an Appreciation by His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury. With Portraits. 15s. net.

CHRISTIANITY AND THE STATE

By the Right Rev. WILLIAM TEMPLE, D. Litt., Lord Bishop of Manchester. 46, 6d, net.

"A subject of pre-eminent importance. . . . These four lectures present a view of the State and its relation to other States meriting attention for its own sake, and their value is enhanced by the author's skill in applying his theories to present-day problems."—The Times.

STUDIES IN CHRISTIAN PHILOSOPHY

Being the Boyle Lectures, 1920. By W. R. MATTHEWS, M.A., D.D., Dean of King's College, London; Professor of the Philosophy of Religion, and Chaplain of Gray's Inn. Second Edition. 8s. 6d. net.

"A book of which we are glad to be able to speak in highly appreciative terms. . . . book."-The Guardian.

THEISTIC MONISM

An Answer to the Question "Is There God?" reached by determining the Relation of Mind to Body. By JOSEPH EVANS, M.A. 128. 8d. net.

MACMILLAN & CO., LTD., LONDON, W.C. 2

Messrs. LONGMANS & CO.'S LIST

Second Impression. Fifteenth Thousand.

Recommended by the Bishop of London for Reading during Lent

CHRIST IN THE COMMON WAYS OF HISE

By the Rev. C. S. Woodward, M.C., M.A., Canon of Westminster and Rector of St. John's. With an Introduction by THE BISHOP OF LONDON.

Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d. net. "To anyone who is seeking for a sensible, frank 'first primer' of Christian living, this book may be commended."—The Guardian.

OUR LORD AND SAVIOUR

A Study of the Person and Doctrine of Jesus Christ. By the Rev. PETER GREEN, M.A., Rector of St. Philips, Sanora, C [Second Impression.] Crown 8vo. Paper covers, 2s. 6d. net; cloth, 4s. net.

THE ETERNAL LIFE: Here and Now

By the Rev. ALEXANDER NAIRNE, D.D., Canon of Windsor and Regins Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. net.

THE GREAT REALITY.

By the Right Rev. G. H. S. WALPOLE, D.D., the Lord Bishop of Edinburgh, An appeal for the realisation of the constant presence of the indwelling Christ in the hearts and minds of His people.

THE ULTIMATE EPOCH, And other Essays

Being a Re-statement of some old Theology. By ARTHUR JOHN HUBBARD, M.D. 8vo. 6s. net.

LONGMANS, GREEN & CO., LTD., 39, Paternoster Row, London, E.C.4

CAMBRIDGE BOOKS

Recently Published

THE OLD TESTAMENT IN GREEK

According to the Text of Codex Vaticanus, supplemented from other Uncial Manuscripts, with a Critical Apparatus containing the variants of the chief ancient authorities for the Text of the Septuagint. Edited by A. E. Brooke, D.D., Norman McLean, M.A., and H. St John Thackeray, M.A., Hon. D.D. (Oxford). Volume II. The Later Historical Books. Part I., 1 and 2 Samuel. Demy 4to. 20s net.

EUSTATHIUS OF ANTIOCH and His Place in the Early History of Christian Doctrine By the Rev. R. V. Sellers. Demy 8vo. 8s 6d net.

CHURCH AND STATE

Political aspects of sixteenth-century Puritanism. By the Rev A. F. Scott Pearson, D.Th., D.Litt., F.R. Hist.S. Demy 8vo. 7s 6d net.

THE LATIN INFANCY GOSPELS

A new text, with a parallel version from the Irish. Edited, with an Introduction, by M. R. James, Litt.D. Demy 8vo. 10s net.

THE BOOK OF AMOS

Edited, with an Introduction and Notes, by R. M. GWYNN, B.D. Fcap. 8vo. 3s (The Revised Version for Schools).

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

Fetter Lane, London, E.C. 4

TELSEASONABLE BOOKS.

THREE STANDARD WORKS by C. A. JOHNS, B.A., F.L.S. With beautifully coloured Plates and other Illustrations.

FLOWERS OF THE FIELD

34th Edition, entirely revised by G. S. Boulger, F.L.S., F.G.S. With Portrait and Memoir of Author. With coloured Plates of 73 flowers, and numerous other Illustrations. Cloth boards. 10s. 6d. net.

BRITISH BIRDS IN THEIR HAUNTS

15th Edition. With coloured Plates of 48 birds and many other Illustrations. A Popular Account of the Birds which have been observed in the British Isles. Cloth boards. 10s. 6d. net.

THE FOREST TREES OF BRITAIN

direct from Nature by Photography, giving the natural colours: photographic reproductions of the leaves of the trees, and numerous other illustrations. 10s, 6d. net.

BUTTERFLIES AND MOTHS

By W. F. Kirsy, F.L.S., F.E.S. With coloured Plates showing about 300 specimens and other Illustrations. Cloth boards. 7s. 6d. net.

A SIMPLE GUIDE TO ROCK GARDENING By Sir James L. Cotter. Cloth boards. 28. 6d. net.

Sir James L. Cotter. Cloth boards. 28. 6d. net.
[Tells the reader how to grow Rock Plants; how to look after a Rock Garden, and the best time and means by which Alpine Plants may be propagated.]

The Sheldon Press NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE, LONDON, W.C. 2

Just Published

THE TRUTH ABOUT FASTING

With Special Reference to FASTING COMMUNION

By PERCY DEARMER

Fasting Communion is a question of great moment today. There has been no book on the subject since the old "little books," once widely circulated, but out of print long before the war. Dr. Dearmer has made careful investigations into the mass of historical misunderstandings and forged evidence which has obscured the subject, and throws new light on this question,

3s. 6d. net.

THE TEXT OF

THE NEW TESTAMENT

By THE REV. K. LAKE, D.D., Th.D., Litt.D.

Winn Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Harvard.

Author of "Earlier Epistles of St. Paul."

SIXTH EDITION REVISED BY SILVA NEW, A.B.

2s. 6d. net.

"It is a very excellent piece of work, a model of really lucid and concise exposition of a very complicated and difficult subject. . . No more serviceable manual of textual criticism is to be found."—Spectator.

RIVINGTONS, 34, King Street, Covent Garden, London

THE HISTORIC MONUMENTS OF ENGLAND

Edited by A. Hamilton Thompson, M.A., Hon. D.Litt. (Durham), F.S.A., Professor of Mediæval History in the University of Leeds.

BAPTISMAL FONTS.

成年为8年4月

Classified and illustrated. By E. Tyrrell Green, With over 100 Illustrations. Cloth boards. 10s. 6d. net.

[A new monograph on fonts by a distinguished archaologist. Over 100 different fonts are described, and an exhaustive index by counties makes the book invaluable for motorists with ecclesiological tastes. It provides a more thorough classification of types of fonts, with a more concise account of their development than is available elswhere. The author has spent many years on personal examination of numerous examples, and his book gives a comprehensive and orderly view of a subject of fascinating study.]

An Account of the Medizeval Glass of the Minster and the Parish Churches. By the Rev. F. Harrison, M.A., F.S.A., Librarian of the Dean and Chapter Library, York, With a Preface by the Very Rev. W. Foxley Norris, D.D., Dean of Westminster, With four coloured Plates and numerous Illustrations. Cloth boards. 12s. 6d. net.

Of this timely volume the DEAN OF WESTMINSTER writes: "Mr. Harrison has devoted years of close and loving care and attention to the windows, and brought his considerable and unusual amount of antiquarian and archeological knowledge to bear upon them."

ENGLISH MONUMENTAL SCULPTURE SINCE THE RENAISSANCE.

By KATHARINE A. ESDAILE. With many Illustrations. Cloth boards. 108. 6d. not. [The writer boldly claims that the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century monuments in our churches are among the artistic glories of our land. The populace has always admired them, but the cultivated, awed by the prestige of the Gothic Revivalists, have scorned them. Mrs. Esdaile's book writes a new page in the art history of our land.]

ENGLISH CHURCH UNION

THE ENGLISH CHURCH UNION still maintains the unique position which it has occupied for seventy years in the Catholic Movement.

It devotes its enormous resources to the steadfast defence of Catholic Doctrine and Discipline, and persists in upholding the claim of the Church of England to be an integral part of the whole Catholic Church of Christ.

It has devoted itself, through its Literature Committee, to the production of literature in all branches of Theology and Ethics.

Early this year it will publish a One Volume Catholic Commentary on the whole Bible, which ought to be of invaluable service to the cause.

The Union, through its Legal Committee and by means of its great financial resources, is able to afford counsel, protection and assistance to all persons, lay or clerical, who may be assailed in any spiritual matter.

In all its activities the Union seeks to co-operate with all other Catholic Societies, and looks forward hopefully to the day when all such Societies may be united and work together under one leadership for the support of Catholic Principles and Practice.

Conditions of Membership: Membership is open to all members of the Church of England and of Churches in Communion with her who are communicants, and the membership is graduated as follows: Full Members, 10/-a year; Associates, 2/6; and Adherents, 1/-.

The Church Union Gazette is published monthly at the incredibly low price of 1/6 per annum, post free.

ARNOLD PINCHARD,

Secretary.

31, Russell Square, W.C. 1.